10

Infants Baptiſme,

Freed From

ANTICHRISTIANISME.

In a full repulſe given to Mr. *Ch. Black-wood*, in his aſſault of that part of Christs poſſeſsion, which he holds in his heritage of Infants.

(Intituled by him)

The Storming of Antichriſt.

Digeſted into three Parts.

In the firſt, Mr. Blackwoods *Arguments (from the teſtimony of Scriptures, Fathers, Councels) againſt Baptiſme of Infants, are anſwered.*
In the ſecond, The Birth-priviledge and Covenant-holines of Beleevers, is aſſerted, & with addition of ſeverall arguments further confirmed.
In the third, Arguments brought by Mr. Stephen Marſhall, *and others. for Baptiſme of Infants, are vindicated and defended.*

By Tho. Blake, Miniſter of the Goſpel.

---

1 Cor. 7. 14. Elſe were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.

Tertul. de anima, cap. 39.

Ex ſanctificato alterutro ſexu, ſanctos procreari Apoſtolus ait, tam ex ſeminis prerogativa, quam ex inſtitutionis diſciplina.

London, Printed by *R. W.* for *Thomas Vnderhill*, and are to be Aprill 29 ſold at the *Bible* in *Woodſtreet*. 1645.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the much Honoured, and truly Religious Lady, the Lady Ruth Scudamore.

Madam,

CVſtome hath ſet up a kind of law, that when a book is publiſhed, ſome Patron muſt be ſought, Being brought upon this work, I had no minde to be irregular having ſo many faire precedents, not only in all ages, and times, but even in ſacred writ it ſelf. And though I have not a *noble Theophilus*, yet I have found *an elect Lady*, on whoſe favour I have preſumed: In which choice, if either deſerved worth, or particular engagements, may be judged, approved, leading motives, I ſhall neither feare, nor deſerve cenſure: All that know you can teſtifie the one, and I know my ſelf abundantly conſcious of the other. But I ſhall not pleaſe your Ladiſhip in the enlargement of either; And though the common calamity (Divine providence ſo diſpoſing) hath ſtript your Ladiſhip of a great part of that which the world runnes after, yet the feare of God is ever of the ſame honour: God had the ſame eſteeme of *Iob* when *friends (hearing all the evill that was come upon him) came to mourne with him, and to comfort him*, as when *he waſht his ſteps with butter, and*

the rocks powred him out rivers of oyle, And *Angels* were attendants, even on *Lazarus* (for a convoy) into *Abrahams* boſome: Though I truſt no eye ſhall ever ſee your Ladiſhip their equall, otherwiſe then in grace, and glory: And this I take to be none of the leaſt of your prayſes, that (growing towards the eventide of your dayes, and neere the haven of your reſt) you have never been obſerved to have been *toſt aſide with any wind of* Doctrine, or to have warpt the leaſt, from the truth that you have been taught: Men never ſhewed more art and diligence then in this age, one maine end of our Miniſtery is to hold the Saints ſteady, This I have endevoured (not out of any ſpirit of contradiction, but in a deſire of unity) to make my buſines, In which (as in a common Scar-fire in their places according to their talents) all ſhould appeare: If I have herein contributed any thing towards the quenching of this flame, that is the whole of my ambition, It is not the worth of the work that hath put it under your Ladiſhips patronage, But a willing deſire, to give teſtimony that I am,

Your Ladiſhips

Humbly Devoted,

Thomas Blake.

To the impartiall Reader.

Bout a yeare ſince, there was preſented from my hand to publike view, a little Treatiſe, called the Birth-Priviledge, *or* Covenant-holineſſe of Beleevers and their Iſſue in the time of the Goſpel. *Which finding acceptance above my expectation, with many godly-learned; I was preſently told that an Anſwer was in framing, and the Particular inſtanced, on which the Whole hinge of the Controverſie (as was ſaid) would turne. After almoſt a yeares ſpace, Mr.* Ch. Blackwood *puts forth a Treatiſe of two parts, intituled,* [The ſtorming of Antichriſt in his two laſt and ſtrongeſt Garriſons, of Compulſion of Conſcience, and Infants Baptiſme.] *Undertaking (in a big ſwolne Title) the proofe of the unlawfulneſſe of Infants Baptiſme, by* 12 *Arguments, with the anſwer of* 26 *Objections againſt it; In particular ſinging out Mr.* St. Marſhals *Sermon on that Subject, together with the Treatiſe before named. This Booke found Mr.* M. *hands full of employment for the Publique, and mee neere unto the gates of death, the fitteſt ſeaſon for an impartiall ſcrutinie into my own breaſt, What inducements put me upon that worke: And in caſe it had been that which Mr.* Blackwoods *charity ſuſpects to involve the moſt, (viz.* Parochiall conſtitution, and the large Tithes that doe accompany it) *My ſin ſure would have found me out, and my retired thoughts would have ſhewed me my folly, in ſuch a purſuit of that, which now could not but appeare to be of a very ſlippery tenure. But as this never was my burden, ſo my Conſcience is my Witneſſe, it is not my ambition; A poore thing, to ſtand in competition with the truth of Chriſt, or to be eſteeemed a fit reward to be retained as an advocate againſt it. No other thing then the advancement of Truth, and prevention of Error, was, or is in my heart; From which Mr.* Blackwoods *Title (as another* Gorgons *head) muſt not ſcare me: His Work is, the Storming of Antichriſt; all his oppoſites then are engaged for Antichriſt; They fight under the Beaſt, and againſt the Lambe; An ill maſter, and a more dreadfull Antagoniſt. But he that will diſclaime all that is fathered on that Man of Sin, as a doctrine of Antichriſt, and follow whatſoever is laid upon the Spirit, as comming from Chriſt; ſhall be a man made up of hereſie, drowned over head and eares (or if you pleaſe, baptized) in error. When men ſhall ſay, here is Chriſt, or there, we are forbidden to be-*

leeve, for there are many false Christs: So, when they shall say, loe here is Antichrist, or there, The same cautelousnesse is needfull; There is the same artifice and danger in both these pretences; A like danger to call good evill, to put sweet for bitter, as to call evill good, and put bitter for sweet; To scratch the face of Truth, as to put a varnish on Error. As the Spirit hath been grieved with the charge of the blackest errors, so Antichrist hath been honoured with over-many truths, with the most of that precious faith that leads unto salvation: For the doctrine of the Trinitie, Antichrist is said to be (a) Et author, & patronus, *both the author, and the patron. The divine nature of Christ, by necessary consequence, is made his figment likewise, together with his incarnation.* Christus est unus ille æternus Deus, clamat Antichristus. *Antichrist (saith my author) affirms that Christ is that one everlasting God. The immortality of the Soul is put upon him likewise.* (b) Negamus aliquam animam post mortem manere, sed illud dicimus excogitatum ab Antichristo ad stabilendam suam culinam per fictum Purgatorium, & invocationem Sanctorum. *We deny that any soule remaines after death, but that it is a fiction of Antichrist to uphold his Kitchin, by a feigned Purgatory, and invocation of Saints. This doctrine (for a good space forgot) is now revived.* (c) I might declare (*saith one*) how Purgatory, Limbo Patrum, Infantum, Prayers unto dead Saints, to the Virgin *Mary*, and a world of such like fancies, are grounded upon the invention of the Soule; and how the most grand and blasphemous heresies that are in the world, the mysterie of iniquitie, and kingdome of Antichrist doth depend upon it. *I should be over-tedious, if I should reckon up the doctrine that Antinomianisme fathers upon him*; Humiliation, Sanctification, Repentance, *and every other work and duty of obedience in conscience of the Commandement. Yea, that very doctrine which (according to Scripture) must be Antichrists bane, is here (by the reprochfull name of Compulsion of Conscience) made one of Antichrists last refuges*, viz. *Kings and States interesting themselves and their power in the cause of Religion. As soon as Higher Powers were Christian, they took upon them this care; and no sooner had the Church a state reformed, but they set upon this work, in which they act what was foretold by the Spirit of God to be their businesse, to be foster-fathers of the Church, and to oppose her enemies.* The ten hornes which thou sawest upon the beast, shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burne her with fire. *Which ten hornes are interpreted to be ten Kings. Let this doctrine now be waved, and Kings and States denied any charge of what concernes the worship of God; the*

a *Antithesis doctrinæ Christi & Antechristi apud Zanc. Responsa. ad Arrian.*

b *Theses Cracoviæ impressæ. 1568.*

c Treatise of mans mortality, by *R. O.* pag. 55.

Isa. 49. 23.

Revel. 17. 16.

vers. 12.

Whore

Whore then may ſit as a Queen, be a Lady for ever, and ſee no ſorrow: Iſa. 47.7.
If any doubt of this interpretation, he may be much ſtrengthned in peruſall Revel.
of Mr. Blackwoods *anſwer to the objection, raiſed from this Scripture:* 18.7.
He is brought to ſay, that the adequate object, of the power of the ten Part. 1.
horns, whether Kings, or States, is onely the Whore of *Babilon*, not ex- Pag. 33.
tending it Self further, how then (*ſaith he*) can it reach all Idolaters? *Let this Whore never have that advantage againſt Kings, and States, to charge them with ſo much partiality, as to puniſh Idolatry in one, & not in others, Either they go without commiſſion againſt this Whore, or elſe their commiſſion reacheth all falſe worſhip, They have it not with any ſuch Proviſo or limit. He further ſaith,* that there are many crimes committed by this Ibid.
Whore againſt the Civil Lawes, for which the temporall ſword of Kings, and States may puniſh her; *But this quarrell againſt her is plainly enough ſignified to be, as a Whore, for her fornication, making the Kings, and inhabitants of the earth drunke with her cup, and not upon by-buſineſſes. He further ſaith,* that this compulſion of the Whore by eating her fleſh, Ibid.
was not done by pœnall Lawes, but onely by force of armes; *In which we demand, whether this force of armes, be an act of juſtice or cruelty, If it be juſt (which I beleeve Maſter* Blackwood *will not deny) where Kings, and States have a power military, they may not be denyed a power civil: They may puniſh where, and whomſoever they may deſtroy. This Doctrine from Mr.* Blackwoods *own pen, may yet further be freed from Antichriſtianiſme.* The ſpirit ſpeaketh expreſly of this departure from the faith, and heed given to ſeducing ſpirits, and Doctrines of 1 Tim.
Devils, (*brooched by Antichriſt*) in theſe later dayes: *The whole* myſtery 4.1.
of that iniquity, *and the* fornications of the whores golden cup, *by the pen of the Holy Ghoſt is foretold. But this Doctrine of conſcience-compulſion crept in (according to Mr.* Blackwood) *the Holy Ghoſt not thinking of it, much leſſe foretelling it,* Little did the Holy Ghoſt (ſaith he) uſeing Part. 1.
ſuch a ſimilitude of love and kindnes think that men would pervert it Pag. 32.
to violence and conſtraint: *But this I do not make my buſineſſe; For that other, of Infants Baptiſme, whether it be any of the baſtard brood of this ſtrumpet (upon view of what here is ſaid) I ſhall leave to thy impartiall cenſure; In which I have ſtudied to avoyd all impertinencies, and (ſo far as the nature of an anſwer will beare) all perſonall circumſtances, that the work might be wholy about the queſtion in hand. Neither hath it ſatisfied me in the moſt important differences, to reſt in the negative, barely to give anſwer to Mr.* Blackwood, *but have endeavoured to give in reaſons that the contrary may appeare to be truth, as in the queſtion of the neceſſity*

cessity of dipping, and Infants being in a capacity to be Disciples, with severall others: And when Mr. Blackwood *comes twise over with any one objection, whether from scripture or reason, as having to deale with severall men useing the same arguments (as neither this, nor scarce any other controversie can be handled, but severall of the same texts and reasons must be used) there I have put them together, giving an account of the severall places where M.* Blackwood *produceth them, And though I could not alwayes print the whole of his words, yet my care hath been, not to passe any argument that may seeme to carry any strength in it, rendring his arguments to the reader in their full strength by him alleadged, descending if it might be to the meanest capacity, that is of any ability to look into this question: The whole I am sure will savour of my weaknes, and the more by reason of my bodily infirmities: Such as it is, it is now thine, If thou canst reape any benefit, let God have all the glory and me thy prayers, who am,*

Of the least of the servants of

Jesus Christ,

Thomas Blake.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Errata.

For literall mistakes, and mispoyntings that do not obscure the sense I shall not trouble the Reader, but in these that follow.

Page 3. line 13. for Ϛαπτίξειν, read Ϛαπτίζειν, p. 11. l. 3. for answer r. answerer. l. 18. for *Disciple* r. *Discipled*. p. 16. l. 26. for evident r. evidently. p. 20. l. 31. for severall instances r. instance. p. 22. *Marg.* for truth r. faith. p. 30. l. 15. for Sexs r. Sexes. p. 31. l. 14. for proportions r. properties. p. 52. l. 16. for *Gennadius* r. *Gennadius*. p. 60. l. 11. for suppositions r. supposititious. p. 62. for your r. in your. p. 65. l. 28. blot out took. p. 88. l. *ult.* for that r. as. p. 93. l. 20. for to force r. of force. p. 102. l. 16. for Scepter r. the Scepter. p. 115. *Marg.* for *Ob.* 11. r. *Ob.* 17. p. 124. l. 5. r. great.

The 22. Objection past by p. 118. the Reader may finde vindicated, p. 82, 83, 84.

Infants Baptiſme,

FREED FROM ANTICHRISTIANISME.

Part 1. *An anſwer to Mr.* Blackwoods *Arguments.*

Mr. *Blackwood.*

Argum. 1.

WHether it be lawfull to baptize Infants? *Queſt.*
It is unlawfull for theſe Arguments. *Anſw.*
The Baptiſme of Chriſt is dipping:
The Baptiſme of Infants is not dipping,
Therefore the Baptiſme of Infants, is not the Baptiſme of Chriſt.

Anſwer.

YOur Minor propoſition, *That the Baptiſme of Infants, is not dipping*; if univerſall (as it muſt be to ſerve your purpoſe) I can challenge, having been an eye-witneſſe of many Infants dipped, and know it to have been the conſtant practiſe of many Miniſters in their places, for many years together, this might have been brought with ſome colour againſt the more ordinary way of Baptiſme of Infants, but hath no ſtrength at all againſt their Baptiſme it ſelfe, though your Major

propoſition were yielded; ſeeing Baptiſme of Infants, and dipping, are not incompatible; Infants may be dipped.

Mr. Blackwood.

I *Prove the propoſition, that the Baptiſme of Chriſt is dipping, three wayes.*

Scapula in verbe. Βαπτίζω.

1. *From the Greeke Lexicon——He gives the prime ſignification to be to drown, dip, or plunge, and ſometimes to waſh: as he cites* Mark. 7. Luk. 11. *Which are all the Authorities he brings; for the word to ſignifie to waſh, he brings no Authority out of any Greeke Author, for to prove it, to ſignifie ſo much as to waſh: But he never gives it the leaſt title of ſignification: as if in any Author, ſacred or prophane, it did ſignifie to ſprinkle.*

Anſwer.

YYour firſt proofe is from an Authority that doth diſprove it; *Scapula* ſayes it ſignifies to *dip, drown,* &c. *and ſometimes to waſh*, and proves that ſignification by two texts of Scripture; which alone is enough to overthrow your poſition: *That Baptiſme is no other then dipping*; Yet this you bring for proofe of it. One *affirmative* overthrowes an *Vniverſall negative*; if we can proove that Baptiſme once ſignifies waſhing (as your *Lexico-graphur* does twice, if it beare any Authority) then your propoſition is falſe: *that the Baptiſme of Chriſt is only dipping.* It is ill ſtumbling at the threſhold.

Words taken out of their prime ſignification.

Si volet uſus.

But you ſay he makes the *prime ſignification to be, to drown, dip,* &c. To which I anſwer nothing is more ordinary, then to have words uſed out of their prime ſignification: It fares with words, as with money. One piece is not the ſame in every age, *Authority* puts a rate upon the one, and *Cuſtome* the ſignification of the other, ἐκκλησία *Church*, in it prime ſignification, *is a company called forth* whoever the men be, or what ever their end of meeting is, and therefore that rude rabble, which met in *Epheſus* for *Diana* againſt *Paul*, they are nam'd ἐκκλησία, which now with us, is a Church, and the Towne-Clarke promiſing, that if they enquire concerning other matters touching *Paul*, it ſhall be determin'd ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ in a lawfull Aſſembly, as we now call it a *Church*, where their civill Courts have the name of ἐκκλησία or Church,

Church, αἵρεσις *hereſie or ſect* in it prime ſignification, is an innocent word, for any opinion whatſoever, in Religion, or otherwiſe, and ſo uſed by the *Apoſtle*, and other Authors. The like we might ſay of *Goſpel*, *Sacrament*, and many other words; as well in Scripture, as in common uſe amongſt us, the Scripture uſe of words we muſt therefore look after to know the Scripture meaning, whatſoever the uſe be in other Authors; and other Authors are not wanting that uſe the word βαπτισμὸς in the ſame ſenſe, as the quoted Scriptures, the Author of the booke *Judith* puts Baptiſme for waſhing, and the *Septuagint* in the, 2 *King*.5. uſe the words *Baptiſme*, and *Waſhing*, promiſcuouſly, neither will great Criticks in that tongue, allow your ſenſe to douſe overhead to be the prime ſignification, diſtinguiſhing between βαπτίζειν and νίπτειν making the later to beare your ſenſe, the former to be a dipping more light and overly, as *Luk*.16.24. it is evidently uſed.

Acts 26.5.

Iudith 12.7.

The prime ſignification of Baptiſme, is not granted to be dipping over head.

Mr. Blackwood.

2. *FRom the difference twixt baptizing, and ſprinkling, in Scripture, we ſee what ſprinkling is* Heb.9.13.19. *The aſhes of an heifer ſprinkling the unclean. So* ver.19. *he tooke the blood of goats, and hyſope, and ſprinkled both the booke, and all the people, The Greeke word is*, Ραντίζω *Now baptizing in Scripture is dipping*, Luk.16.24. (*a*) *Send Lazarus* ἵνα βάψῃ *that he may not ſprinkle, but dip the tip of his finger in water*; Joh.3.23. John *was baptizing in* Aenon *neer to* Salem, *becauſe there were many waters, or much water there which would; have been needleſſe, had ſprinkling been the manner of baptizing*, Matthew.3.6. *they were baptized of* John *in* Jordan: Mar.1.8. *I baptize you with water, So it is in the Greeke; which he could not have ſayed, had he not applied the ſubject to the water. But ſpecially*, Mar.1.9. *they were baptized of* John *into* Jordan, *which ſignifies the word to meane to dip, not to ſprinkle, and it ſhewes there was an application of the perſon to the water, not of the water to the perſon, as it is in ſprinkling. So* ver.10. *ſtraight way comming out of the water*. Act.8.38,39. *Philip and the Eunuch* (*b*) *they went both of them into the water, and he baptized him. So much appeares in the phraſe, buried with him by Baptiſme*. Rom.6.4. Col.2.12. *For it ſhewes there muſt be a dipping in it, or elſe there can be no buriall.*

Anſwer.

COmpare *Revel.*19.13. with *Iſa.*63. And you will find there no ſuch difference, but the word βεβαμμένον renderd in our Tranſlation (*Rev.*19.) *dipped*, to be no other in *Iſa.*63. then *beſprinkled*; but whatever the difference be between them, though *ſprinkling* be not at all *baptizing*, it yet makes little to your purpoſe, ſeeing thoſe that *dip not infants*, do not yet uſe to *ſprinkle them*, there is a middle way betwixt theſe two; I have ſeen ſeverall *dipt*, I never ſaw, nor heard of any *ſprinkled*, or (as ſome of you uſe to ſpeake) *rantiz'd*. To ſprinkle in the Scriptures that you quote, is ſo to caſt water, that it may fall *guttatim*, drop by drop, on the ſubject *beſprinkled*, water in thoſe purifications, was mingled with the blood, that it might not be by congealing unfit to ſprinkle; *Scarlet wool, and Hyſſop, were* the inſtruments wherewith they ſprinkled, in imitation of which, the *Papiſts ſprinkle* with their holy-water, that it may fall *as by drops of raine*, and to that end, they uſed an inſtrument called *aſpergillum*, a new word indeed, (ſaith the Popiſh Civilian (*John Calvin*) but a ſignificant one. Hence *reproaches* are called *aſperſions*, by a Metaphor drawn from *ſprinkling*; which being by any liquid ſubſtance of a ſtaining nature, it leaves a ſpot or macula behind; Our way is not by *aſperſion*, but *perfuſion*, not by *ſprinkling drop by drop*, *but pouring on at once*, all that the hand containes, and ſo in the Directory, in the book of Common-Prayer, *if the child be weake it ſhall ſuffice to poure water upon it*, which accordingly hath been practiſed; *Sprinkling*, properly ſo called, being a way of application of water to the ſubject, I doubt not, but were it uſed, Baptiſme were yet held. And therefore ſome (that yeeld in this queſtion more then they need, yet far leſſe then will ſerve your purpoſe) maintaine that *rantiſme* is *Baptiſme*, *ſprinkling* is *baptizing*, but I leave them to defend it that uſe it.

The preſent cuſtome in Baptiſme is by powring, not ſprinkling.

Calvin Lexicon jurid.

For your Scriptnre *Luke* 16.24. That *dipping* is not deep enough ro reach your end; it had ſufficed the man in torment, if water had been put upon *Lazarus* his finger, as well as if his finger were put into the water.

*Revel.*17.1. For *John* 3.23. You do well to read *many waters*; ſo it is read elſewhere, in which place the ſignification can be no other, and this

this reading takes off the whole force of your Argument. *John* having multitudes to Baptize in those hot Countries, might well seek a place where he, and his disciples might at once be imployed; One water of depth sufficient, would have serv'd for the use of *dipping*, For *dippings sake* he might have sought for a *deep*, but needed not seek *many* waters.

For *Math.*3.6. *Mar.*1.8. As you reade them, they are plaine against you.

For *Mar.*1.9. They were baptized of *John into Jordan*, which being not so read in our Translation, but *in Iordan*, we have the originall in the margent, together with your marginall annotation: *Though in some heathen authors εἰς, is used for ad, yet in Scripture it is used* for *into*. In your former reason, when the Scripture use of βαπτιζω, was urged, it was not with you sufficient, because other Authors did not so use it, and now other Authors using a word against your sense, you are contented to oppose against it onely Scripture, but if both Scripture, and heathen Authors are herein against you, what will then be your refuge? For heathen Authors, we have your own grant.

For Scripture, Master *Cooke* hath saved me a labour of search, and might have furnished you with many instances. a *He dwelt in a City of Nazareth*; b *He dwelt in Capernaum*; c *Neither possesse money in your purses*; d *In the name of a Prophet*; e *Shee hid it in three pecks of meale*. In all of which εἰς, is used, and I think you would not render it *into* in these Scriptures; so that here might be an application of the water to the person, notwithstanding this præposition.

(a) *Mat.*2.23. (b) *Mat.*4.13. (c) *Mat.*10.9. (d) *Mat.*10.41. (e) *Mat.*13.33.

For your marginall Criticisme of *ascending*, and *descending*, if you compare *Act.*24.1. and *Act.*25.1. with your places quoted, you will see it nothing for your purpose; Those phrases are used when men go to a place, or from a place; when they neither ascend upwards, nor descend downwards. B. *Vsher* will furnish you with ten severall Scriptures where the word καταλθειν in the Acts of the Apostles is used *for no descent from a higher place to a lower, but onely a removing from place to place*, though in this place we may beleeve, that there was some *ascent* and *descent*, waters being in lower places; and when they went to the place of waters, the channell in which the waters had their current; they may be fitly said

Answer to a challenge. pag.390.

said to go into the water, howsoever one or two examples serve not your purpose, but a generall concurrence of all examples: we have examples giving full evidence of a different practise: And nothing can be concluded for you from these examples of yours.

Master Blackwood.

3. THat *Baptisme signifies no other thing but dipping, appeares from the proportion, and lively resemblance betwixt dipping into the water, and rising up again*: Dipping *signifieth death and buriall with Christ, and rising up above the water, Resurrection with Christ*, Rom. 6. 3. 4. Col. 2. 12.

Answer.

IF by Baptisme we are planted into the likenesse of Christs death, and also made partakers of His resurrection, will it follow therefore, that there must be some ceremony in the application of the water to resemble it? A *proportion* here we grant, but we would heare of an *institution.* Man must be Author neither of Sacraments nor of Sacramentals: if you may take this liberty of argument, give me leave to attempt the like, and with as good reason conclude. 1. That *Baptisme* is no other then *sprinkling*, as appeares by that proportion, between *sprinkling of water*, and that *blood of sprinkling, that speakes better things then that of Abel*: Sprinkling of *blood* and *water* did foreshadow it, and sprinkling of water may be the fittest to signifie and seale it. 2. He that reades that text of Scripture *Heb.* 10. 22. in your Title Page, *Let us draw neere, having our hearts sprinkled from an evill conscience, and our bodyes washed with pure water*, together with your application of it to Baptisme, would scarse think, that you would dispute against all Baptisme, except dipping. 2. That Baptisme is no other, then *pouring out of water* upon the person baptized, as appeares from the proportion, and lively resemblance between the giving of the Holy Ghost, and pouring out of water, according to the promise in the Prophet, and the reall performance recorded by Saint *Luke*. 3. That *Baptisme* is no other then *washing* as appeares by the proportion between washing with water (*called the putting away the filth of the flesh*) and the washing away of sinnes by Christs blood. *Arise and be baptized, washing away thy sinnes*

The argument drawn from proportion in the outward rite of Baptisme retorted.

Pag. 59.

Ioel. 2. 28. *Acts* 2. 17.

1 *Pet.* 3. 21. *Acts* 22. 16.

ſinnes in the name of the Lord. You ſee what you will gaine by theſe diſputes from analogie and proportion, without divine inſtitution.

Here you undertake the anſwer of Objections.

Mr. Blackwood.

MArk. 7. 8. *The Phariſees held the Baptiſme of pots and cups: where Baptiſme ſignifies waſhing.* Object.

1. *It ſignifies ſuch a waſhing as is by dipping: for uſually, when we waſh pots and cups, we doe not ſprinkle them, but dip them.* Anſw.

2. *In waſhing pots and cups, we waſh them all over; which is not only dipping, but totall dipping.*

3. *Whereas,* verſ. 4. *the word* beds *is uſed: they held the waſhing of brazen veſſels, and beds; for the word κλίνη only ſignifies a bed, and never a table: I ſuppoſe they waſh them by dipping them ſome way or other in water: but ſure they never ſprinkled them: they dipped them, becauſe they were legally polluted.*

Anſwer.

VSuall dipping when we waſh pots and cups, is no ſatisfaction of the objection, unleſſe you could prove that we never waſh otherwiſe than by dipping; ſeeing the proofe is on your part, *that Baptiſme is no other than dipping:* If ever the Phariſees waſht, and not dipped, the objection is ſtill of force. And though we uſe to dip pots, and cups, yet we doe not ſo to brazen veſſels. You doe (you ſay) ſuppoſe they waſhed their beds ſome way or other by dipping: And I ſuppoſe few will be of your mind, that they took ſuch paines to carry ſuch woodden utenſils ſo often to the water: And I pray you ſpeak ſincerely your thoughts, whether you believe that the Phariſees, as oft as they came from market, (whither it ſeemes they went often, being ſuch that loved greetings there) plunged themſelves over head and eares before they eat any meat? The Text (you know) is, *When they come from the market, unleſſe they be baptized, they eat not.* This baptizing, ſure, was ſome other way than by dipping and douſing over head and eares, which the word, with you, neceſſarily implies. Some may think that they dipt their hands, and that appeares was the Baptiſme that the Evangeliſt meanes: when their hands were waſht, they were waſht;

Baptiſme, in Scripture-language, is not only dipping.

Object.

Solut. waſht; when their hands were dipt, they were dipt. But this ſerves not our Adverſaries purpoſe, ſeeing no dipping but a totall one, with them, is Baptiſme; in which the perſon is douſed, drowned, or buried under water: No Baptiſme, but when the whole ſubject baptized is under water; which could not be the way of theſe Phariſees ſo frequently; neither could the Phariſees expect, that Chriſt ſhould thus dip himſelfe before dinner; and yet they marvailed that he did not firſt baptize.

Luk. 11. 38.

You are favouradle to your ſelfe in your choice of Objections: Give me leave to frame ſome to your hand.

Arguments againſt the neceſſity ot dipping.

First, From the ſignification of the word on which you ſo much inſiſt.

1. From the ſignification of the word.

1. *Phariſaicall waſhings* were not alwayes *dippings*: it is very improbable that they *dipt their beds*: certaine it is, that as often as they went to the market, they did not *dip themſelves*. But *Phariſaicall waſhings are Baptiſmes*. Therefore *Baptiſme* is not alwayes *dipping*.

Heb. 9. 10.

2. *Legall purifications*, are not alwaies *dipping*: you know them ſometimes to be ſprinklings. But *legall purifications*, in the diſtinct kinds and ſpecies of them, are *Baptiſmes*. Therefore *Baptiſme* is not alwaies *dipping*.

Secondly, From the Primitive practiſe, and manner of baptizing.

2. From the Primitive practiſe.

1. If the way of *Baptiſme* were only *dipping*, then the baptizer muſt put the baptized over head into the water, and after a ſpace receive them up againe. This is plaine; otherwiſe he could not ſay, in your ſenſe, *I baptize thee*. But we read of no ſuch thing any where in Scripture: we find *Chriſt* and the *Eunuch* going to the water, and comming thence, but neither *John* nor *Philip* putting them into the water, or taking them from thence.

2. If Scripture-way of baptizing were thus to dip, or drowne; then the baptizer and the baptized muſt both put off their garments, and lay them aſide for that buſines: therefore thoſe that have put a kind of neceſſity upon dipping, have ſpoken much of being received naked in Baptiſme: but we find no ſuch thing once mentioned; we find one in the New Teſtament ſtoned, and the laying aſide of the garments of the witneſſes (who were firſt to have a hand in his death) is more than once mentioned: But among all the multitudes that were baptized, there is not one word of uncloathing

Acts 7. 18. *Acts* 22. 20.

clothing for that end, nor yet the putting on of garments after Baptisme; when yet sometimes (as we shall hear) there had been all reason for the mention of it.

3. It was the Apostles way to baptize Disciples, as soon as they were become converts, the same day, rather sometimes the same houre, as we see in the *Eunuch*, the *Jailour*, *Lydia*, and multitudes of others. But conversion of Disciples sometimes must necessarily happen when there was no season for dipping, the element of water being over-cold for that service. If any object, that in those hot Countries there was no danger in the coldest times: I answer, the Commission being for all Nations, Disciples were made in all Countries, how soon came the Word to this Nation, some yeares before any Church was planted at *Rome*, as some Papists have acknowledged: Histories tell us of *Simon Zelotes*, and *Joseph of Arimathea*, that came hither for that worke.

4. Sometimes the number of converts was so numerous, three thousand, five thousand on one day, that there was no possibility of Baptisme in that manner. *Act.* 2. 41. *Act.* 4. 4.

5. Sometimes the baptizers were in that condition, that they were unable for the work in that way. When *Paul* and *Sylas* had converted the Jailour, they straightway baptized him and his household. They were men new taken out of prison, out of the stocks in the inner prison, with such stripes, that their Convert was faine forthwith to wash them: in this case they were unfit to wade into the water for that worke; and had they made any such adventure, Scripture would not have been silent. *Act.* 16. 33.

6. Sometimes the baptized have not been in case for dipping and plunging: which was *Pauls* case, upon the apparition of the vision he was led into *Damascus*, where he continues without meat or drinke three dayes; and upon *Ananias* comming and instructing of him, he is baptized; *And when he had received meat* (saith the Text) *he was strengthened.* Will any believe that he went out in this case with *Ananias* into the water, over head in water, before the taking of any sustenance? And in case he had done so, we should sure have heard that apparell had been put on him, and dry and warme clothes applied to him before meat had been given him. *Act.* 8. 19.

7. Sometimes Baptisme was administred, where water for dip-

ping was not to be had, and though the Eunuch comming to a river might ſay, here is water, what doth hinder that I ſhould be dipped? yet there is little probability that *Paul* could ſay ſo in *Judas* his houſe, *in Straight-ſtreet in Damaſcus*, nor the Jaylor in his priſon in *Philippy*. You ſay, that Baptiſme was ordinarily in Rivers where *there* were *many waters*, but ſure there were neither many waters, nor rivers in theſe mens dwellings, and as ſure that they went not out, one ſaint, and the other with their ſtripes in the night unto any ſuch places, and yet they were baptized; *Aquinas* was a man zealous for the uſe of dipping, as is generally the popiſh party and popiſhly affected, ſo that here you ſeeme rather to joyne in gariſon for Antichriſt, then to fight againſt him, they lay much waight upon the work done, and no little holines in the element it ſelf, and then they think it thoroughly and to purpoſe done, when ſo much water is applied that they may be waſhed all over, of *Peters* mind, not to be *waſhed in one part onely*. He yet confeſſeth the lawfullneſſe of other wayes then dipping in ſeverall caſes, as *the great multitude of perſons to be baptized; The ſcarcity of water, not ſufficing for dipping, the weaknes of the perſon baptizing, and the danger of the perſon to be baptized*, and you ſee his caſes are Scripture caſes, and if not dipping had been no baptizing, they that could not be dipped, would never have been ſaid to have been baptized, ſo that againſt you I conclude: Every Baptiſme, which for the outward rite, is dipping, waſhing, or ſprinkling, is in that reſpect the Baptiſme of Chriſt.

Jo. 13. 9.

Aquinas part 3. quæſt. 76. Art. 7.

But the Baptiſme of Infants is either dipping, waſhing, or ſprinckling: therefore

The Baptiſme of Infants is for the outward rite, the Baptiſme of Chriſt.

Maſter Blackwood.

Argum. 2.

MIniſters who are Chriſts Commiſſioners, ought to cleave cloſe to their Commiſſion.

But to make Diſciples before Baptizing, is the Miniſters Commiſſion.

Therefore Miniſters, who are Chriſts Commiſſioners, ought to cleave cloſe hereto.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

YOur concluſion in your ſyllogiſme, is not the propoſition in queſtion, and ſo againſt all rules of diſputation. If the anſwer can ſay *non concludis negatum* (as here and in ſeverall other of your arguments any may ſay to you) there needs then no more to be ſpoken, In a good ſenſe, in Scripture ſenſe I am content to yeeld the premiſes, and let you go away with your concluſion; But ſeeing the ſenſe of this Commiſſion is ſo much controverted, we will look further into this diſcourſe, that ſo the ſenſe of it may be cleered, in which we find ſeverall exceptions as you pleaſe to call them, but none againſt the Commiſſion it ſelf, that is *Exceptione Majoris*, nor againſt the neceſſity of holding cloſe to the Commiſſion, but againſt the expoſition and comment which you uſually put upon it.

For your firſt exception, *concerning the morality of the order of the words.* (If we may put a morality upon it) I will not ſtand, though ordinarily no way of reaſoning from Scripture is more unſound; yet I willingly grant, that *Nations, not Diſciple, may not be baptized.*

For your third exception, puting a diſtinction between *a Church gathered, and gathering, and faith going before, or following Baptiſme.* You ſure intended it an exception to your fourth argument, where you ſpeake of the qualification of faith in perſons to be baptized: whither I referre it. Your ſecond, and fourth, I have more cauſe to take notice of, in ſatisfaction of which, I can neither do my ſelf right, nor yet diſcover your dealing, unleſſe I take liberty to acquaint the Reader, with that which is already publiſhed in the birth priviledge, where having made an obſervation by way of inference from a Doctrine before handled, of the lawfulnes of Infants Baptiſme, you may ſee *Pag.* 20. this objection.

Chriſts Commiſſion to diſciple Nations, and baptize them, explaned.

An inſtitution for Infants Baptiſme is wanting, we have no precedent for the baptizing of Infants; the inſtitution is, go teach all Nations Baptizing them, &c. We muſt Baptiſe thoſe, whom by teaching we have Diſcipled, ſo the word ſignifieth: To which this anſwer following is returned.

I anſwer, Firſt, That which hath been ſaid doth conclude that they are within the verge of an inſtitution; being ſuch that have ſo

full title: I have heard one of the moſt learned and reverend that ever I knew or heard of, that was of that way, more then once profeſſe with no ſmall ſolemnity, that *if he knew an Infant to be ſanctified as he acknowledged* John Baptiſt *was, ſuch a one he would baptize*: And that *the particular infants whom Chriſt was ſeen for to bleſſe might have been baptized*: Thoſe then that are thus intitled, through want of an inſtitution, are not to be excluded, and how farre and fully Infants of beleeving parents are intitled, we have heard

2. The place quoted hath not in it the *Inſtitution* of that Sacrament: *Baptiſme* was appointed of *God* before thoſe words were uttered; He that ſpoke them was *himſelf before baptized*; They to whom they were ſpoken had *baptized others*; It is only an enlargement of their Commiſſion for the exerciſe of their Miniſtery, being before confined unto one Nation, now it is enlarged to all Nations.

*Mat.*3.16. *Ioh.*4.6. *Mat.*10.5.

3. The words there comprize infants, they are no more excluded then men of yeares, ſerving to make up a Nation as well as parents: The Infants of *Niniveh* did make a conſiderable party of the City of *Niniveh*; The Infants of any Nation make up a part of the Nation; and the Nation where they came was to be diſcipled, And that Infants are here comprehended further appeares by this argument.

* In the ſame ſenſe and latitude as *Nation* was taken in reſpect of the Covenant of God, when *the Covenant, and Covenant-initiating Sacrament* was reſtrained to that one only Nation, where their Commiſſion was firſt limited: In the ſame ſenſe it is to be taken (unleſſe the text expreſſe the contrary) now the Commiſſion is enlarged.

This cannot be denied of any that will have the Apoſtles to be able to know Chriſts meaning by his words in this enlarged Commiſſion.

But *Nation*, then as is confeſſed did comprehend all in the *Nation* in reſpect of the Covenant, and nothing is expreſſed in the text to the contrary, therefore it is to be taked in that latitude, to comprehend Infants.

Will it be ſaid that an exception of Infants is implied, in that all of the *Nation* muſt be diſcipled before they be baptized, but *Infants* are not capable of being diſcipled, and ſo they are made uncapable of Baptiſme.

* This argument hath ſtrength from that of the Apoſtle, *Act.* 3.25. As it was with the kindred of *Abraham* in reſp. of covenant holineſſe, ſo it is with all kindreds of the earth, they jointly make one party in the Covenant: But infants of *Abrahams* kindred were in the Covenant, and of the nation in reſpect of Covenant-bleſſedneſſe, *Ergo* &c. Object.

I

I anſwer, 1. Here is rather implyed that they are of capacitie to be Diſciples, in that Chriſt ſends *to diſciple Nations*, and they ſerve to make up the *Nation*. Anſw. 1.

2. It is the way of the Scripture, ſpeaking of an univerſality of a people in a land, expreſſly to except infants, in caſe they be to be excepted: As we ſee in the judgement that befell Iſrael in the wilderneſſe *to the cutting off* of thoſe that came out of the land of Egypt. And in the Covenant entred by the body of the *Nation of all degrees and ſexes* at their returne from Babylon, and an exception could be no where more uſefull and neceſſary then here, to let us know that it is otherwiſe with Gentiles in this particular then it was with the Iewes, that the Nations where their Commiſſion is thus enlarged were herein differenced from the Nation to which their Miniſtry was firſt limited. 2. *Numb.* 14.31. *Nehem.* 10.28.

3. Let that text of the Prophet be well weighed, (where ſpeaking by the ſpirit of prophecy of the rejection of the Jewes, and the glorious call of the Gentiles in their ſtead, in that ample way as it is there ſet out) hath theſe words, *Behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and ſet up my ſtandard to the people: and they ſhall bring thy ſonnes in their armes: and thy daughters ſhall be carried upon their ſhoulders.* If there were but ſuch an hint as that by way of propheſy to have left them behind, we ſhould from ſome have heard of it with a noiſe. *Iſa.* 49.22.

4. In the Lord *Chriſts Dialect*, who is beſt able to expreſſe his own meaning, they are *Diſciples*, To *belong to Chriſt* is to be a *Diſciple of Chriſt*, This is plaine from our Saviours own mouth, comparing his words recorded in *Matthew* and *Mark*, *To give a cup of cold water to drink in the name of a diſciple*, it is in the one; *To give a cup of water to drink in my Name, becauſe ye belong to me*, it is in the other: To *belong to Chriſt*, to be *a Diſciple of Chriſt*, and to beare *the Name of Chriſt* is one and the ſame thing with our Saviour. Now that Infants are of the number of thoſe who as *Diſciples* in Chriſts account doe *belong unto him*, and beare *his Name*, is yet further plain by another text of St. *Matthew*, where Chriſt ſetting a *little childe* in the middeſt of his hearers ſaith, *Who ſo ſhall receive one ſuch little child in my Name, receiveth me.* By all which it appeares, that which is done to *Infants* is done to *Diſciples*, hath a glorious *reward* as done to *Diſciples*; *Infants* *Mat.* 10.42. *Mar.* 9.41. *Mat.* 18.5.

therfore *are Diſciples of Chriſt, are of thoſe that do belong unto him,* and beare *his Name:* who then is not afraid to *refuſe* them who will *receive* Chriſt? who will not baptize them that is willing to baptize Diſciples in the Name of Chriſt? *Thus far the Birth Priviledge.*

Except.2. Maſter Blackwood.

IOhn Baptiſt did Baptize before this Commiſſion was given, Joh. 1.26. *and ſo did Chriſts Diſciples* John.4.2. *Therefore this was not the Commiſſion, but an enlargement thereof.*

Anſw. *We onely finde the practiſe, before we finde out any Commiſſion for the practiſe, and in that practiſe we find onely beleevers, and repentants baptized, not Infants. 2. Its like Chriſt gave them a Commiſſion by word of mouth for what they did, but this is the Churches Commiſſion by writing to the end of the world.*

Anſwer.

WIll not the practiſe of *Iohn Baptiſt*, and the Apoſtles of Chriſt with his approbation, Baptizing in his name, conclude a Commiſſion; this of yours is *Bellarmines* obſervation, far more becoming him then you, but both of you me thinks might beleeve *Iohn Baptiſt*, who ſaith, *he that ſent me to baptize with water, the ſame ſaid,* &c. And alſo the Evangaliſt Saint *Luke*, who makes Gods word *Iohns* Commiſſion. Let me ſpeak to you in the words of Chriſt, *the Baptiſme of Iohn* (ſo of the Apoſtles) *was it from Heaven, or of men?* and if of men, how did thoſe that refuſed his Baptiſme *deſpiſe the Councell of God againſt themſelves*, and whereas you adde, that *this is the Churches Commiſſion to the end of the world*, and in the ſixth exception (the ſame with the ſecond) *that Miniſters are tied to obſerve the enlargement of this Commiſſion, as well as any former*, there is none that can make queſtion of it, but both Commiſſions (I hope) may be compared, that either may be underſtood, which is the alone ground of that obſervation made in the birth priviledge, not to take any exceptions againſt the latter, but that one might give light to the other, and by comparing of both, we might come to know the ſenſe of each, that as in the former ſo in the later infants are comprized, which you might have ſeen, and let your Reader have known, if you had not paſſed over in ſilence, the greateſt part of that anſwer, eſpecially the ſyllogiſme brought on this occaſion.

Lib.1. de Bap. cap.20.

Ioh.1.33.

Luke 3.23.

Mat.21.25. Luk.7.30.

Maſter

Mr. Blackwood.

Excep. 4. *THe commiſſion is, Make diſciples all nations, baptizing them: But Infants are capable of being made diſciples: For firſt, to belong to Chriſt, and to be a diſciple of Chriſt, is all one*, Mat. 10. 42. *compared with* Mar. 9. 41. *Secondly*, Act. 15. 10. *All they upon whoſe necks the falſe teachers would have put the yoke of circumciſion, are called diſciples: But they would have put this yoke upon infants as well as others, therefore infants are diſciples. Thirdly, to belong to Chriſt, and to be a diſciple, are not all one; for the one may be in preſent, the other in poſſibility. Its true in grown and converted diſciples, not in infants.* Mr. M. p. 39.

Anſw. *To the former, Infants belong to Chriſt, not in reſpect of viſible conſtitution, but in reſpect of myſticall union: and not all, but only elect infants. 2. Chriſt ſpeaks not of infants, but of diſciples grown up*, Mat. 10. 42. Mar. 9. 41. *And theſe he makes all one with belonging to Chriſt, though he call them little ones; it is becauſe they are little in their own apprehenſion.*

For that, Act. 51. 10. *The falſe teachers did not goe about to put a yoke upon the neck of Infants, but only on the Brethren, as appeares* verſ. 1. 2. *Though Infants might be ſenſible of paine, yet could they not be ſenſible of a yoke: only the Diſciples were ſenſible of this, and therefore they only are meant.*

Anſwer.

THe Reader may obſerve in the words before recited out of the *Birth-Priviledge*, theſe ſeverall Propoſitions:

1. That the words in this enlarged Commiſſion to diſciple Nations, compriſe Infants; which is proved two wayes:

Firſt, Where the Apoſtles had their firſt Commiſſion, Infants were comprized, and that in reſpect of *Church*, as well as *Civill* intereſts: In *Judea* Infants were Church-members.

Secondly, There is no exception of Infants, when yet it is uſuall in Scripture, when they are to be excepted.

2. That Infants are in a capacity to be Diſcipled, and incorporated into the ſchoole of Chriſt, which is evidently implyed in that Infants are part of the nation, and the Commiſſion is to Diſciple all Nations.

That

That interpretation which makes the Commiſſion of Chriſt impoſſible, and unfeaſable; is not to be admitted.

But that interpretation which excludes Infants from all capacity of being Diſciples, makes the Commiſſion and Command of Chriſt impoſſible, and unfeaſeable, therefore it is not to be admitted. A conſiderable part of the Nation, have by this expoſition, a freſh bar put without any word from Chriſt, that they may not have the honour of being Diſciples.

3. That Infants are Diſciples, which propoſition is there made good by Scripture teſtimony, to which you endeavour to returne anſwer, ſo that your pro-ſyllogiſme ought to have been: *Thoſe that are no Diſciples of Chriſt ought not to be baptized.*

But Infants are no Diſciples of Chriſt, Ergo. &c.

Infants of Beleevers are Diſciples.

The Argument in the words recited you ſee, *to belong to Chriſt, & to be a Diſciple of Chriſt, and to beare the name of Chriſt, is one & the ſame; But Infants are of the number of thoſe that belong to Chriſt, and beare the name of Chriſt. Therefore Infants are Diſciples.*

Here we ſhall firſt ſee how ſubſtantially you anſwer: and ſecondly how learnedly you diſpute.

Arguments vindicated.

Your anſwer is firſt, a peremptory deniall, *to belong to Chriſt, and to be Diſciples are not one*, 1. Giving us a reaſon, ſuch as it is, *The one may be in preſent, the other in poſſibilitie*: When both may be alike in preſent, and both alike in poſsibilitie. 2. You give us a double diſtinction: *It is true* (you ſay) *in growne and converted Diſciples, not in Infants.* This diſtinction, where the context evident implies it, may not be admitted: here where the context is full againſt it, it is brought forth. This holds true of thoſe that are capable of the gift of a cup of cold water, or ſuch refreſhing: But Infants are capable of ſuch a gift from any merciſull hand. 2. You ſay, Infants belong to Chriſt, *not in reſpect of viſible conſtitution, but myſticall union; and not all infants, but elect ones*: to which you might have further added, nor all the elect; for the elect unregenerate are not in Chriſt: But it is *viſible conſtitution* for which we contend, and a viſible way of belonging to Chriſt Jeſus, when Chriſt admitted Infants, he gives a reaſon extending not to ſome in peculiar, but to all Infants in Iſrael, to whom he was ſent, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven*: The viſible Church is made up as well of them as others. They that beare Chriſts name

are

are Diſciples, and belong to *Chriſt*, in regard of viſible conſtitution; but Infants beare Chriſts name, *who ſo ſhall receive one ſuch a little child in my name, receiveth me*: where little one is taken properly, as appeares in the context, and not by way of metaphor, the little child there pointed at, is ſuch a one from whom the metaphor is drawn: To deſtroy the Infants of *Babylon*, who were of the body of thoſe that were the enemies of Chriſt, and bred up for oppoſition of Him aud His people is a happy work; To receive or releive the Infants *of the Church*, being of the body of thoſe that belong to Chriſt, and bred up for his ſervice, is a work as acceptable: Here I expect ſomewhat more then a bare denyall, or naked diſtinction without ſtrength of a ſyllable of reaſon, *that to belong to Chriſt, to beare the name of Chriſt, and to be a Diſciple of Chriſt, is one and the ſame*: when Scripture we ſee uſeth them thus promiſcuouſly, and ſomewhat more then a bare deniall *that infants viſibly do belong to Chriſt*, when Chriſt gave ſuch viſible teſtimonies of receiving them. Mat. 18. 5. Pſal. 137. 8.

For that other Scripture, *Act.* 10. 15. brought by *Maſter M.* You ſay, *that the falſe teachers did not go about to put a yoake upon the neck of Infants, but of the brethren, as appeares ver.* 1. for anſwer, I pray you conſider, was it *Moſes* his manner to require circumciſion of grown men onely, or of infants likewiſe? You muſt deny circumciſion of Infants in the time of the law, as well as Baptiſme of Infants, in the dayes of the Goſpel, or elſe this proofe of yours, proves the yoke to be laid on Infants; For your further anſwer, *That Infants might be ſenſible of paine, yet could they not be ſenſible of a yoke*, The reply is eaſy, it might be a yoke, though the ſenſe of it was not perceived: A *Capite Tenure* in this nation, is a burden on an infant that inherits which in his infancy, he apprehends not, it is in the text a burden, and not a ſenſible burden, it was impoſed on thoſe that for preſent were not ſenſible of it.

Maſter Blackwood.

NOw that Infants are not Diſciples, firſt becauſe a diſciple in Engliſh is a ſcholler, now what can Infants learn?

Auſtin *ſaith, Infants to know divine things that have not yet known humane things, if in words we would ſhew, I feare we may ſeem to offer injury to our ſences, when by ſpeaking we perſwade it.*

Thoſe that go about to make Infants ſchollers or diſciples, they do not only loſe their paines, but expoſe themſelves to laughter.

Anſwer.

YOur anſwer we have ſeen for your arguments to the contrary here brought forth, to avoid ſtrife of words, I thus anſwer, Diſciple is taken two wayes.

Objections anſwered.

1. Strictly for one that actually learnes, and is of capacity to be inſtructed.

2. More largely for thoſe that are taken into the number incorporated into the body, and veſted with the priviledges of thoſe that ſtrictly, and actually are diſciples.

In the firſt ſenſe I acknowledge Infants are not Diſciples, which is all that *Auſtin* can meane: the latter is enough to beare the name, and to enjoy the priviledges, and in this ſenſe Scripture calls them, and they are Diſciples.

The truth further illuſtrated,

To make this yet more plaine according to the cuſtomes of men and language of the holy Scriptures, he that is taken into a ſociety and fellowſhip of Artiſts, he beares their name, is of their body, and enjoyes their priviledges, though he never have learned, much leſſe uſed their Art, or is of capacity for it: He that makes *Saddles* is properly a *Sadler*, he that makes *Girdles* a *Girdler*, he that makes *Shooes* a *Shoomaker*, as he that *actually learnes*, is ſtrictly and properly a *diſciple or ſcholler*, yet civill Incorporations will tell you that a man free of thoſe Companies, goes by that name, is of their body, and enjoyes their priviledges, though he never learned nor uſed their Art at all: A ſubject is one that yeilds ſubjection, that obeyes the edicts and commands of his Soveraigne, and enjoyes the priviledges and immunities of the nation, yet an infant that ever is heard to cry is of that number, and when ſuch a one is murdred, the law proceeds againſt the man-ſlayer as guilty of the blood of one of His Majeſties ſubjects, being borne under the priviledge of his protection; the propheſie concerning Chriſt is, that *the kingdomes of this world, are become the kingdomes of our Lord, and of His Chriſt*, in as large an extent as they have belong'd to earthly Monarches, they being diſcipled, do appertaine to Chriſt Jeſus.

Revel. 11. 15.

To come nearer the thing in queſtion, we ſometimes ſend little ones

ones to ſchoole, not to learne, but to keep out of danger, yet theſe little ones being taken into the number of thoſe that actually learne, and deſigned for learning, go under the name of ſuch a teachers ſchollars.

To acquaint you with Scripture language in that which is every way paralell, and as obnoxious as this to your laughter: As a *Diſciple* is in reſpect of learning, ſo a *ſervant* is for labour, and paynes taking, at the yeares that a man may be a ſervant, he may be alſo a Diſciple, but Infants, in Scripture language are ſervants, reſpective to men they are called ſervants, reſpective to God they are ſo called likewiſe. And confirmed.

1. Reſpectively to men, ſee *Exod.* 21.2,4. *If thou buy an Hebrew ſervant, ſix yeares he ſhall ſerve, and in the ſeventh he ſhall go out for nothing, if his Maſter have given him a wife, and ſhe have borne him ſonnes or daughters, the wife and her children ſhall be her maſters, and he ſhall go out by himſelf:* Wife, and Children are here in one condition, all of them are ſervants to the maſter, whoſe right they were, and where the law of villanage, or bondage holds, a child new borne is the ſervant of his parents maſter, and bound to ſerve when he is of ſtature and ability, in alluſion to which *David* ſayes, *O Lord, truly I am thy ſervant, I am thy ſervant and the ſon of thy hand-maid,* becauſe he was borne in Gods houſe, a child of a ſervant of his, he is therefore himſelf a ſervant, and every child of a Diſciple of Chriſt, is as well a Diſciple of his, being bound to know Chriſt, as theſe are to ſerve their maſter. Exod. 21.2.4. Pſal. 116.

2. Reſpectively to God they are ſervants: *And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be ſold unto thee, thou ſhalt not compell him to ſerve as a bond ſervant, but as an hired ſervant, and as a ſojourner he ſhall be with thee, and ſhall ſerve thee unto the yeare of Iubilee. And then ſhall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and ſhall returne unto his own family, and unto the poſſeſſion of his fathers ſhal he returne: For they are my ſervants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt; they ſhall not be ſold as bond men:* All that came out of *Egypt*, parent and child are here the Lords ſervants, none of theſe, neither parent nor child may be ſold for bond men, for that reaſon, their Infants were then in right the ſervants of God, and were in a capacity to be made the ſervants of men. Levit. 25.39. &c.

In concluſion take one further Argument.

The diſcipling of men in a Nation, and catching of men in the draw-net of the Goſpel, are both one, and the ſame: this way men
Mat.13.47. are brought into the Church, which there in the parable is the Kingdome of Heaven, But Infants of beleeving parents are of that number, of ſuch is the Kingdome of Heaven, as our Saviour himſelfe teſtifies, Infants then are thus brought into the Church, infolded with their parents in this net, and together with them diſcipled, The Kingdome of Glory you ſay is eſpecially meant in that teſtimony of our Saviour, ſalvation is of ſuch, and then by neceſſary conſequence the viſible ſtate of the Church muſt be underſtood, (which in Chriſts language is ſtill the Kingdome of Heaven) ſee-
Acts 2.42. ing God addes to the Church thoſe that ſhall be ſaved.

Now if not only the civill cuſtomes of men, and uſuall language in the world; but *Peter*, *Moſes*, and our *Saviour* himſelfe be fit ſubjects for your ſport, you may take your bellyfull of laughter, only let me tell you that he that laughes at it, makes himſelfe a ridicle.

Mr. Blackwood.

2. *THe very commiſſion ſhewes, what kinde of diſciples Chriſt meant in theſe words; teaching them (αὐτὰς not αὐτὰ which muſt agree with μαθητὰς not ἔθνη) to obſerve all things that I have commanded them, but this cannot Infants doe.*

Anſwer.

YOu might have done well, to have ſhewed us ſome reaſon; why we muſt looke for an antecedent to αὐτὰς not in the text, but in your braine, The text hath ἔθνη not μαθητὰς and the reader will looke into the booke, and not hunt elſe where for it; but you imply an incongruity of ſuch a reference, by reaſon of the difference of gender which you borrowed (as a great deal more) from the Author of the Treatiſe of Childiſh Baptiſme; but if you had conſul-
M. Cook pa. 31. ted his learned anſwerer, you might have ſeen ſeverall inſtances given in Scripture of ἔθνη and αὐτὰς joyned together, and frequent in-
Acts 15.17. ſtances of maſculine relatives joyned with it; beſides a Grammer
Acts 8.28. rule of *Lillies* for the defence of it, the text is cleare, that thoſe
Acts 13.48. whom they were to diſciple they, were to teach; which is all Na-
Rom.2,14.15. tions, and not all Diſciples.

Maſter

Mr. Blackwood.

5. *Excep.* CHriſt ſaith, *baptiſe all nations; but children are part of the nation, therefore they may be baptiſed.*

Anſw. *In the propoſition there is a fallacie of diviſion, whereby one conjoyned propoſition is divided into two pieces. As a certain Atheiſt that would prove out of Scripture there was no God, for which he alleaged the* 14. Pſal. *verſ.* 1. *where it is ſaid, there is no God: but he left out the foregoing words, the foole hath ſaid in his heart. So here Chriſt ſaith, baptiſe all nations; but he conjoynes with it, make diſciples all nations: which the objector here left out.*

Anſwer.

THis is the man that *being reviled will not revile againe, Atheiſt* is the worſt word which a brother ſhall heare from him, But if here be any fallacy, I aſſure the reader that it is none of the objectors *ſophiſtry*, but the Stormers *forgery*. I challenge this daring Champion (who ſo contumeliouſly ſlanders the Churches of Chriſt, for garriſons of Antichriſt, and then ſo inſolently inſults over them) to produce the man that ever laid the waight of this concluſion, *that Infants are to be baptized* upon this one obſervation, *that they are part of the nation.* And I appeale to the Reader, whether the objector (as here he is termed, though in that place where theſe words are mentioned he is only an anſwerer) does not take in the words of *diſcipling the nations*, to make up the argument for Infants Baptiſme, you may find it indeed affirm'd, *that Infants are part of the nation*, and affirmed alſo, *that the Infants of thoſe that are diſcipled, are diſciples, and to be baptized.* But to joyne theſe, *they are part of the nation*, and *therefore to be baptized*, as premiſes and concluſion is the fallacie *a bene diviſis, ad male conjuncta*, that which rightly apart is obſerved by the *objector*, is fallaciouſly put together by the *Stormer*. But thoſe whom Maſter *Blackwoods* teaching doth diſciple, taking all on truſt that he ſpeakes, muſt beleeve any thing againſt ſuch that he oppoſes, I ſay no more but if his *Atheiſt* have found no fairer dealing then his adverſarie, he might be as honeſt as himſelfe in intermedling with Scriptures; I could tell him of ſuch, who would looſe their God, rather then their jeſt, ſure ſuch an over-worne and thred-bare

In concluſion take one further Argument.

The diſcipling of men in a Nation, and catching of men in the draw-net of the Goſpel, are both one, and the ſame: this way men
Mat.13.47. are brought into the Church, which there in the parable is the Kingdome of Heaven, But Infants of beleeving parents are of that number, of ſuch is the Kingdome of Heaven, as our Saviour himſelfe teſtifies, Infants then are thus brought into the Church, infolded with their parents in this net, and together with them diſcipled, The Kingdome of Glory you ſay is eſpecially meant in that teſtimony of our Saviour, ſalvation is of ſuch, and then by neceſſary conſequence the viſible ſtate of the Church muſt be underſtood, (which in Chriſts language is ſtill the Kingdome of Heaven) ſee-
Acts 2.42. ing God addes to the Church thoſe that ſhall be ſaved.

Now if not only the civill cuſtomes of men, and uſuall language in the world; but *Peter*, *Moſes*, and our *Saviour* himſelfe be fit ſubjects for your ſport, you may take your bellyfull of laughter, only let me tell you that he that laughes at it, makes himſelfe a ridicle.

Mr. Blackwood.

2. *THe very commiſſion ſhewes, what kinde of diſciples Chriſt meant in theſe words; teaching them* (αὐτὸς *not* αὐτὰ *which muſt agree with* μαθητὰς *not* ἔθνη) *to obſerve all things that I have commanded them, but this cannot Infants doe.*

Anſwer.

YOu might have done well, to have ſhewed us ſome reaſon; why we muſt looke for an antecedent to αὐτὸς not in the text, but in your braine, The text hath ἔθνη not μαθητὰς and the reader will looke into the booke, and not hunt elſe where for it; but you imply an incongruity of ſuch a reference, by reaſon of the difference of gender which you borrowed (as a great deal more) from the Author of the Treatiſe of Childiſh Baptiſme; but if you had conſul-
M. Cook pa. 31. ted his learned anſwerer, you might have ſeen ſeverall inſtances given in Scripture of ἔθνη and αὐτὸς joyned together, and frequent in-
Acts 15.17. ſtances of maſculine relatives joyned with it; beſides a Grammer
Acts 8.28. rule of *Lillies* for the defence of it, the text is cleare, that thoſe
Acts 13.48. whom they were to diſciple they, were to teach; which is all Na-
Rom.2.14.15. tions, and not all Diſciples.

Maſter

Mr. Blackwood.

5. *Excep.* CHriſt ſaith, *baptiſe all nations; but children are part of the nation, therefore they may be baptiſed.*

Anſw. *In the propoſition there is a fallacie of diviſion, whereby one conjoyned propoſition is divided into two pieces. As a certain Atheiſt that would prove out of Scripture there was no God, for which he alleaged the* 14. Pſal. *verſ.* 1. *where it is ſaid, there is no God: but he left out the foregoing words, the foole hath ſaid in his heart. So here Chriſt ſaith, baptiſe all nations; but he conjoynes with it, make diſciples all nations: which the objector here left out.*

Anſwer.

THis is the man that *being reviled will not revile againe, Atheiſt* is the worſt word which a brother ſhall heare from him, But if here be any fallacy, I aſſure the reader that it is none of the objectors *ſophiſtry*, but the Stormers *forgery*. I challenge this daring Champion (who ſo contumeliouſly ſlanders the Churches of Chriſt, for garriſons of Antichriſt, and then ſo inſolently inſults over them) to produce the man that ever laid the waight of this concluſion, *that Infants are to be baptized* upon this one obſervation, *that they are part of the nation*. And I appeale to the Reader, whether the objector (as here he is termed, though in that place where theſe words are mentioned he is only an anſwerer) does not take in the words of *diſcipling the nations*, to make up the argument for Infants Baptiſme, you may find it indeed affirm'd, *that Infants are part of the nation*, and affirmed alſo, *that the Infants of thoſe that are diſcipled, are diſciples, and to be baptized*. But to joyne theſe, *they are part of the nation*, and *therefore to be baptized*, as premiſes and concluſion is the fallacie *a bene diviſis, ad male conjuncta*, that which rightly apart is obſerved by the *objector*, is fallaciouſly put together by the *Stormer*. But thoſe whom Maſter *Blackwoods* teaching doth diſciple, taking all on truſt that he ſpeakes, muſt beleeve any thing againſt ſuch that he oppoſes, I ſay no more but if his *Atheiſt* have found no fairer dealing then his adverſarie, he might be as honeſt as himſelfe in intermedling with Scriptures; I could tell him of ſuch, who would looſe their God, rather then their jeſt, ſure ſuch an over-worne and thred-bare

one might have been ſpared rather then a brother, ſo ſlanderouſly and contumelioufly traduced, ſo that I conclude.

The Diſciples of Chriſt belonging unto him, and bearing his name ought to be baptized.

But Infants of Chriſtian parents belong to Chriſt, and beare his name in Scripture language are Diſciples.

Therefore Infants of Chriſtian parents ought to be baptized.

Mr. Blackwood.

Argum. 4. and 5.

THe Baptiſme of Chriſt, is the Baptiſme of actuall repentance.

The Baptiſme of Infants, is not the Baptiſme of actuall repentance.

Therefore the Baptiſme of Infants, is not the Baptiſme of Chriſt.

The Baptiſme of Chriſt requires faith as an inſeparable condition or qualification to the right receiving of it, without which it ought not to be adminiſtred.

But the Baptiſme of Infants doth not require faith as an inſeparable condition or qualification.

Therefore the Baptiſme of Infants is not the Baptiſme of Chriſt.

The propoſition appeares, 1. From Scripture, which tels us that Chriſts Baptiſme requires faith as an inſeparable condition, Mar. 16. 16.

Anſwer.

YOur third and fourth argument I ſhall put together, being of one ſtampe, diſputing from the qualifications of the baptized, and admitting one and the ſame anſwer, more eſpecially applying my ſelf to your fourth an order, in which you are moſt large, and though you conclude not with the propoſition in queſtion, yet the drift of your diſpute (as appeares in the confirmation of your premiſes) is, that *faith only makes capable of lawfull Baptiſme. But Infants want faith: Therefore Infants are not lawfully baptized.*

For anſwer, we muſt diſtingniſh of the want of faith, and ſo alſo of repentance, which is twofold.

Want of truth
Negative.
Privative.

1. *Privative*, the want of that grace in a ſubject capable of it, and by the precept of the Goſpell called to it.

2. *Negative* where it is not, but not expected, nor the ſubject of capacity to receive it.

Now

Now it is not a meere *Negative*, want of faith that makes uncapable of Baptiſme: but that which is *Privative*, the unbeleefe of a perſon of capacity to beleeve; this I ſhall make good out of the Scripture by your ſelf quoted. The not-beleeving which the words of Chriſt mention, as excluding from Baptiſme, excludes alſo from Salvation, this is evident, the ſame waight is laid on both he that beleeves not, as he may not be *baptized*, ſo he alſo ſhall be *damned*.

But bare negative, not-beleeving (which is the want of faith in Infants) excludes not from ſalvation: Therefore this negative not-beleeving, or Infant want of faith, excludes not from Baptiſme.

Thus diſputing againſt their Baptiſme, you ſhut them out of the Kingdom of Heaven; what qualification, or limit you can put upon the one, I ſhall apply to the other.

For your inſtance in the *Eunuch*, his unbeliefe had been of another nature, being of capacity to beleeve, and an actuall faith was required to entitle him and his poſterity to the Covenant of God, and therefore an actuall profeſſion of faith was juſtly required.

For the confirmation of your Aſſumption *that Infants have not faith* in the ſenſe that you take it, I ſhall willingly yeeld it, confeſſing your ninth page to containe more reaſon then the whole book beſides.

Mr. Blackwood.

Object. BUt though *Infants have not actuall faith, yet they have* Seminall *faith*.

Anſw. *This is a vaine diſtinction, For* 1. *There is but one faith*, Epheſ. 4. *conſiſting in taking and relying on Chriſt if we underſtand juſtifying faith, and one profeſſion of faith, which metonymically is called faith, and goeth current for faith in all Eccleſiaſticall Diſpenſations.*

Reply.

THough faith be but one, yet it may admit of a double conſideration in the *roote*, and in the *fruit*, in the *beginning*, and in the *growth and maturity* of it, and when you confeſſe that *profeſſion of faith is called faith metonymically*, why may not the firſt principle and ſeed of faith be ſo called by the ſame Figure, I beleeve you have read of a *Metonymie of the Cauſe*, as wel as of the *Adjunct*, and

and howſoever we build not the Baptiſme of Infants upon any Seminall faith ſuppoſed to be in them, but upon more certaine and indubitate grounds, yet this diſtinction deſerves no ſuch cenſure as you pleaſe to put upon it.

Whereas you ſay, *there can be no ſuch thing as Seminall faith in Infants, becauſe the firſt ſeed of faith is Illumination, of which, Infants are not capable*, I anſwer, though the firſt ſeed of faith wrought by the ordinances of the word in a miniſteriall way were *Illumination*, yet it followes not that it is ſo where there is an immediate work onely, as in Infants, neither is *Illumination* in an ordinary way the firſt ſeed, but the *ſpirit* from whence *illumination* flowes: Your ſelf even now ſaid, *that elect Infants belong to Chriſt in reſpect of myſticall union:* If you know the principle, of that union, then you know this principle, or ſeed of faith, the ſame principle which unites in its ſeaſon, produceth the act of faith in a ſubject capable. *Page 5.*

You further ſay, *this word Seminall doth meerly delude men by the metaphoricall acception, to make men think there is a phyſicall growth of faith, as in ſeeds of vegetative bodies, when they are ſowen, when the growth is metaphyſicall, and only in reaſonable ſoules, who are fit ſubjects thereof.*

Anſw. You do not I hope think that the word 1 *Iohn* 3.9. works any ſuch deluſion, and you ſuppoſe men to be very apt to groſſe deluſions to conceive a growth of faith in the *earth*, and not in *reaſonable ſoules*, I would that all endeavours to delude were of this kind ſo eaſie to be diſcovered, and though (as I ſaid) this faith is not our ground for Infants Baptiſme being undiſcernable, ſo we ſhould fall upon the abſurdity, of your party, to maintaine that this Sacrament is applied upon the ground of Charity, and not certainty, upon hopes that the perſon is of capacity, and not upon aſſurance, yet the diſtinction it ſelf may very well ſtand, and all that you have ſaid diſcovers no vanity in it, your ſelfe I ſuppoſe acknowledge a firſt principle of reaſon in Infants, diſtinguiſhing them from other creatures, though not diſcernable by any fruits, how can you then but acknowledge a firſt principle of faith, or grace in regenerate Infants, (if you confeſſe any regeneration in Infants) diſtinguiſhing them from all in their meer and naturall condition? A more full anſwer to this argument, the Reader elſe- *B. Pri. pag. 19. & 20.*

where

where may pleaſe to peruſe, which in this aſſault you have been pleaſed totally to wave.

Your Argument drawn from the qualification of Repentance, admits the ſelfe-ſame Anſwer. You ſay, *No Repentance, no Baptiſme*, Act. 2. 38. I ſay, no Repentance, no Salvatiou, *Luk.* 13. 5. You believe that Infants may avoyd damnation, though they repent not; and ſo cannot men of yeeres. Upon the ſame ground you may conclude, that Infants may be baptized, though not men of yeares not repenting. So that I conclude,

That want of faith and repentance which debarres from Baptiſme, excludes alſo from ſalvation.

But want of faith and repentance in Infants excludes not from ſalvation. Therefore,

The want of faith and repentance debarres not Infants from Baptiſme.

Mr. Blackwood.

Argum. 5.

THe children of wrath are not to be ſealed with the ſeal of grace. Baptiſme is a ſeale of grace. Therefore, Infants are not to be ſealed with the ſeale of grace. Storm of Antichriſt, *p.* 11.

Anſwer.

THis Syllogiſme, with the whole Confirmation of the parts of it, hath nothing but confuſion: ſo that you ſeem indeed rather upon the buſineſſe of a ſtorme, than in any ſober mood framing an Argument. The *medius terminus*, viz. *ſeale of grace*, is not only in both your Propoſitions, but (againſt all rules of Logick) in your Concluſion likewiſe. *Medius terminus nunquam ingreditur concluſionem.*

The Propoſition is undoubted; becauſe every man, as he comes into the world, is by nature the child of wrath, Epheſ. 2. 3.

Anſw. This Scripture indeed doth evidence the naturall condition of Infants, and all others; but hath not a ſyllable to deny them the ſeale of grace, or to debar them from Baptiſme. It is of equall force againſt the Baptiſme of *Paul*, and all other beleevers: for he applies this Text to himſelfe, and all other beleeving Chriſtians. We ſhall doubt of nothing, if we may not doubt of ſuch inconſequences. I ſhall put the Argument into forme for the Readers help, that ſo it may receive a more formall Anſwer.

Children of wrath are not to be ſealed with the ſeale of grace:

and howſoever we build not the Baptiſme of Infants upon any Seminall faith ſuppoſed to be in them, but upon more certaine and indubitate grounds, yet this diſtinction deſerves no ſuch cenſure as you pleaſe to put upon it.

Whereas you ſay. *there can be no ſuch thing as Seminall faith in Infants, becauſe the firſt ſeed of faith is Illumination, of which, Infants are not capable*, I anſwer, though the firſt ſeed of faith wrought by the ordinances of the word in a miniſteriall way were *Illumination*, yet it followes not that it is ſo where there is an immediate work onely, as in Infants, neither is *Illumination* in an ordinary way the firſt ſeed, but the *ſpirit* from whence *illumination* flowes: Your ſelf even now ſaid, *that elect Infants belong to Chriſt in reſpect of myſticall union:* If you know the principle, of that union, then you know this principle, or ſeed of faith, the ſame principle which unites in its ſeaſon, produceth the act of faith in a ſubject capable.

Page 5.

You further ſay, *this word Seminall doth meerly delude men by the metaphoricall acception, to make men think there is a phyſicall growth of faith, as in ſeeds of vegetative bodies, when they are ſowen, when the growth is metaphyſicall, and only in reaſonable ſoules, who are fit ſubjects thereof.*

Anſw. You do not I hope think that the word 1 *John* 3.9. works any ſuch deluſion, and you ſuppoſe men to be very apt to groſſe deluſions to conceive a growth of faith in the *earth*, and not in *reaſonable ſoules*, I would that all endeavours to delude were of this kind ſo eaſie to be diſcovered, and though (as I ſaid) this faith is not our ground for Infants Baptiſme being undiſcernable, ſo we ſhould fall upon the abſurdity, of your party, to maintaine that this Sacrament is applied upon the ground of Charity, and not certainty, upon hopes that the perſon is of capacity, and not upon aſſurance, yet the diſtinction it ſelf may very well ſtand, and all that you have ſaid diſcovers no vanity in it, your ſelfe I ſuppoſe acknowledge a firſt principle of reaſon in Infants, diſtinguiſhing them from other creatures, though not diſcernable by any fruits, how can you then but acknowledge a firſt principle of faith, or grace in regenerate Infants, (if you confeſſe any regeneration in Infants) diſtinguiſhing them from all in their meer and naturall condition? A more full anſwer to this argument, the Reader elſe-

B. Pri. pag. 19. & 20.

where

where may pleaſe to peruſe, which in this aſſault you have been pleaſed totally to wave.

Your Argument drawn from the qualification of Repentance, admits the ſelfe-ſame Anſwer. You ſay, *No Repentance, no Baptiſme*, Act. 2. 38. I ſay, no Repentance, no Salvatiou, *Luk.* 13, 5. You believe that Infants may avoyd damnation, though they repent not; and ſo cannot men of yeeres. Upon the ſame ground you may conclude, that Infants may be baptized, though not men of yeares not repenting. So that I conclude,

That want of faith and repentance which debarres from Baptiſme, excludes alſo from ſalvation.

But want of faith and repentance in Infants excludes not from ſalvation. Therefore,

The want of faith and repentance debarres not Infants from Baptiſme.

Mr. Blackwood.

Argum. 5.

THe children of wrath are not to be ſealed with the ſeal of grace. Baptiſme is a ſeale of grace. Therefore, Infants are not to be ſealed with the ſeale of grace. Storm of Antichriſt, *p.* 11.

Anſwer.

THis Syllogiſme, with the whole Confirmation of the parts of it, hath nothing but confuſion: ſo that you ſeem indeed rather upon the buſineſſe of a ſtorme, than in any ſober mood framing an Argument. The *medius terminus*, viz. *ſeale of grace*, is not only in both your Propoſitions, but (againſt all rules of Logick) in your Concluſion likewiſe. *Medius terminus nunquam ingreditur concluſionem.*

The Propoſition is undoubted; becauſe every man, as he comes into the world, is by nature the child of wrath, Epheſ. 2. 3.

Anſw. This Scripture indeed doth evidence the naturall condition of Infants, and all others; but hath not a ſyllable to deny them the ſeale of grace, or to debar them from Baptiſme. It is of equall force againſt the Baptiſme of *Paul*, and all other beleevers: for he applies this Text to himſelfe, and all other beleeving Chriſtians. We ſhall doubt of nothing, if we may not doubt of ſuch inconſequences. I ſhall put the Argument into forme for the Readers help, that ſo it may receive a more formall Anſwer.

Children of wrath are not to be ſealed with the ſeale of grace:

Infants are children of wrath: Therefore,
Infants are not to be ſealed with the ſeale of grace.

To this I anſwer, A child of wrath is conſidered two wayes:

See *Birth-Priviledge,* pag. 3.

1. *So by nature*; Originall corruption putting him into that condition.

2. *So in his preſent ſtate and condition*; Not tranſlated and changed through grace.

If you underſtand according to your Text quoted, *a child of wrath by nature*; your argument then excludes all the world, all the Churches in the world from Baptiſme. Were not your Churches (which you ſpeak of) in *Tranſilvania* and *Holland*, thoſe that you are gathering in *England*, *children of wrath by nature*? if you underſtand a *child of wrath in preſent ſtate and condition*, then it is a heavy doome that you paſſe upon Infants, that *they are children of wrath:* Then wrath is alone the portion that they muſt inherit.

Mr. Blackwood.

Obj. *BUt if Infants, as well as others, be children of wrath by nature, then they dying in their infancie muſt needs be damned.*

Anſw. *No; naturall defilement with originall ſinne, doth not ſimply damne; it ſhewes there is ſomething in us that deſerves damnation; but it doth not appeare from Scripture grounds, that any perſon was damned for it alone.*

Anſwer.

YOu expect that your Readers eye ſhould run as looſe as your pen. Your objection is, *Children of wrath*; and your anſwer is, *Originall defilement:* when yet you believe no ſuch defilement in originall ſinne, as that it alone ſhould bring wrath upon any perſon. Anſwer, I pray you, the objection as it may be put in its full ſtrength.

Thoſe that are ſo under wrath, that they are uncapable of a ſeale of grace, dying in this condition are damned.

But Infants, according to your Doctrine, are ſo under wrath, that they are uncapable of the ſeale of grace.

Therefore Infants in this incapacitie of the ſeale of grace are neceſſarily damned.

Was

Was the *ſonne of perdition* (that Scripture ſpeakes of) I pray, ſaved, or damned? a child of wrath ſo remaining can be in no better ſtate and condition; and I deſire your further helpe to reconcile theſe things: *that Infants through wrath are debar'd from the ſeal of grace, and yet ſaved (through grace) by the preſentment of Chriſts death to Gods juſtice.* I had thought his death had taken off wrath, and wrought a reconciliation, and that thoſe that are thus ſaved had been *no children of wrath*, but *accepted and beloved.* You are troubled to heare any charge of *Pelagianiſme* upon any of your party, yet you too evidently manifeſt how willingly you would ſhake hands with them; ſuch a ſerpent as *originall ſinne* you confeſſe man brings into the world in his boſome, But a *braſen-one* only it ſeemes, and *no fiery one*, The ſting of death you deny to be in it, where you ſay that *originall ſinne doth not ſimply damne, and that all dying Infants are ſaved with* Davids *Infant, in reſpect of their innocency from actuall ſinne*, The univerſall damning power of originall defilement we can prove, *Fleſh and blood cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven: Except a man be borne againe he cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven. By nature the children of wrath*, is an abundant proofe of it. *Nature* renders all objects of divine vengeance; you muſt therefore either find ſome univerſall remedy, or elſe conclude from this ſcripture in another manner. For your inſtance of *Davids* child, was this hope of his grounded upon the opinion of the univerſall happineſſe of all Infants, as well Heatheniſh, as Jewiſh: or upon the free promiſe made of God to him, and his ſeed? If all dying Infants are ſaved, either they are all in Chriſt regenerate by the ſpirit, or elſe all originall ſinne is to be denied.

1. Cor. 15. 50. Ioh. 3. 3. Epheſ. 2. 3.

Mr. Blackwood.

2. *AS men have a charitable opinion concerning thoſe Infants that died uncircumciſed in the wilderneſſe for 40. yeares ſpace, and of thoſe Infants that died before the inſtitution of Circumciſion, and of the children of Chriſtians in the Primitive Church that died before their parent, or parents, were chriſtianized: So muſt we have the ſame charitable opinion concerning other Infants. Yea thoſe that hold Baptiſme of Infants, hold their Infants dying after Baptiſme to be ſaved, and yet they confeſſe Baptiſme doth not take away originall ſinne.*

Anſwer.

THis charity of theirs was never grounded upon any conceived immunity in thoſe Infants from all damnable guilt, but on their title to that Covenant whereof circumciſion was a ſigne and ſeale. And why doe you inſtance in Infants *dying before circumſion*, who have no other eſteeme of *circumſion* then that it was *a burden, and no priviledge, a carnall badge, and no ſeale of any Covenant of grace?* They that hold Baptiſme of Infants, hold indeed that Infants dying before Baptiſme are ſaved. But no man that I know, ever held, that Infants uncapable of Baptiſme through the wrath of God, are in any ſaving condition.

Mr. Blackwood.

2. *THe Scripture revealing every man to be a child of wrath by nature, looks upon them under that notion, till there be ſome profeſſion or appearance of the contrary, reſerving ſtill a charitable judgement for thoſe that dye in their infancy, and the rather becauſe Chriſt ſaith, Of ſuch is the Kingdome of Heaven.*

Anſwer.

HOw doth the Scripture looke upon them under the notion of wrath, when by your owne confeſſion, Chriſt ſaith, *Of ſuch is the Kingdome of Heaven?* and you have no more than charity to beleeve the election of thoſe that make profeſſion, many Infants are not elected, which is as true of many baptized profeſſors, *Math.*22.14. Therefore in Baptiſme let us not looke at election or regeneration, but the free admittance of God to the ordinance, the outward part of the Covenant, a ſtep in Gods ordinary diſpenſation to the inward; ſuch are *nigh*, having this great advantage, when others are *afarre off*. If your charity admits profeſſors (whil'ſt you have like charitie towards them) deny not Infants.

Maſter Blackwood.

CIrcumciſion was no ſeale of grace to the nation of the Jewes: for perſons that in a ſtate of rejection, as Iſhmael *and* Eſau *had it, yea all that were bought with a Jewes money, What it was to* Abraham *alone, we ſhall dipute of it further hereafter. Circumciſion*

sion was an obligation to keep Moses *Law, see* Rom. 2.24. Gal.5.3, 6, 13, Act.15.5.

Answer.

HOw is Baptisme then a seale of grace to Christians, when *Iudas, Simon Magus, Hymineus* and *Philetus*, were baptized? Where you further dispute it, we shall further enquire after it.

Master Blackwood:

Argum. 6.

Storm of Antichrist, *p.* 12.

Acts 8.10,12. *There is mention made of a Whole Citie baptized, or at least of a great part of it, Who after they* beleeved Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Iesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women: *There is no mention made of beleevers, and their seed, but onely of men and Women; Surely, among so many beleevers there were many children, which had they been baptized, the Scriptures would not have been more silent of their Baptisme then of their parents, especially seeing children are named with their Parents when there is occasion, Acts 21. vers.5.* They all brought us on our way with wives and children, till we were out of the Citie. *Should an Heathen (in time when Iewish Worship was required) have come to a Priest, and told him that he beleeved in the God of Israel, & desired to be joyned to the Iewish Church: the Priest would tell him, If you joyne to us, you must have the foreskin of your flesh cut off, and the foreskin of all your males: This Proselite might reply; this circumcision is painful, where do you finde it written? the Priest would instantly turne to the* 17. of Genesis, *and shew him where it is written. In like manner, An Heathen comes to a Minister, and tels him that he beleeves in Iesus Christ, and desires to joyne to a Christian Church: The Minister tells him if you joyne to us, you must be baptized, you and your children: Now should the Heathen reply, where do you finde it written? do not you think the Minister would be greatly puzled to prove it, and would he not be ashamed to fetch his Covenant from* Moses, *and his signe or seale from Iesus Christ.*

So that I conclude, if the Samaritans men and Women, had children or Infants, why had they not brought them.

Anſwer.

HEre we have a negative argument; No infants are mentioned in this *Scripture*, and therefore none were baptized in this *City*: which might in a meere circumſtance induce ſome probability of conjecture, if no probable reaſon can be aſſigned for the omiſſion of the mention of them, but yet no abſolute certainty: *Men and Women* are mentioned in the Text, which (as Grammarians obſerve) ſometimes note the *age and growth in years and ſtature*, as differencing them from *children*; ſometimes they note the *Sex*, as differencing the *male* from the *female*: The ſex, and not the age is intended, 1 *Cor.* 11. 3. *The head of every man is Chriſt, and the head of the Woman is the man.* The age, and not the ſex is intended, 1 *Cor.* 13. 11. *When I was a child*, &c. *When I was a man*, &c. The *Sex* is here in this place noted, and not the *age and growth*, as appears in the diſtinct mention of both ſexs, and the age or growth not mentioned at all: And that in all probabity to diſtinguiſh *Baptiſme* in this particular from *Circumciſion*, where the male was circumciſed, not the female, but here male and female; men and women, are both baptized: And an argument of more ſtrength from hence may be collected for Infants Baptiſme, then againſt it; ſeeing that difference from Circumciſion is expreſly noted, and the ſubjects admittable to this Sacrament (by the addition of this ſex) are now *enlarged*; but here is no mention of any *reſtraint* of it, that Infants before received ſhould now be debarred.

The ſubjects admitable to the ſeale of the Covenant in the Goſpel are enlarged but not reſtrained.

The *enlargement* we have in this place, and *Act.* 16. 15. But the *reſtraint* is no where to be found, and Infants are here comprized, being either *male* or *female*, *ſex*, not age being mentioned, *the Sex* is intended.

And for your Scripture *Acts.* 21. 5. there is not the like reaſon, *Infants* were neither *husbands* nor *wives*, and therefore they are mentioned apart, when *men* and their *wives* are named; but they are either *male* or *female*, and therefore in this place they are comprized. For your ſuppoſition of a *heathen* converted to *Chriſtian Religion*, thouſands of thouſands in the world made converts have received ſatisfaction, whereby it appeares how much eaſier it is to ſatisfie an humbled Heathen, then to ſtop the mouths of ſcruple-coyning Chriſtians. And I conclude, that *Samaritans* had no children but either *male* or *female* ones, and that there is an *enlarge-*

ment

ment of Baptiſme beyond Circumciſion, but no reſtraint of it, that in the ſubjects admitable it ſhould come ſhort of it.

Mr. Blackwood.

Argum. 7.

ACts 19.2,3 4,5. *Baptiſme of perſons that want faith in one of the perſons of the Trinity, is inſufficient.* Storm of antichriſt. p. 13.

Infants at Baptiſme wants faith, not onely in one, but in every perſon of the Trinity, therefore their Baptiſme is in ſufficient.

For the Aſſumption, we have proved before, that Infants want faith at their Baptiſme.

Anſwer.

FAith in one or any of the perſons of the *Trinity* is twofold.

1. *Explicite*, as able to diſtinguiſh each perſon with their ſeverall proportions to know a Trinity of perſons in the unity of eſſence.

2. *Implicite*, To know one God *Iehovah* being of himſelf, and giving being to all, in covenant with his elect, and reconciled to them, though not diſtinctly knowing any Trinity of perſons in their diſtinguiſhing properties.

To make Baptiſme inſufficient in all in whom this explicite knowledge is not found, is (I ſuppoſe) to nullifie and make void the Baptiſme almoſt of all whom *Iohn* baptized: the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament* very darkely ſpeake of a Trinity, and without light of the *New Teſtament* can hardlybe diſcerned; Scriptures of the New Teſtament were not then written, and what *Iohn* preached on that ſubject to us is unknown: much more will it make void the Baptiſme of the *Tranſilvanian Churches* of your Judgment, who as with you they make the Baptiſme of Infants a Doctrine of *Antichriſt*, ſo they make the Doctrine of the Trinity to be a Doctrine of *Antichriſt* likewiſe, and the Popes Triple Crown to be an emblem of it: ſo that though you had ſtormed theſe two garriſons, (which as yet you have very weakely aſſaulted) yet you would have a challenge for holding a third your ſelf for the ſame party, and we ſhal heare of the *Garriſon-ſtormer himſelfe ſtormed*: either you muſt joyne hands with theſe brethren againſt a *Trinity of perſons*, or after the example (as you pleaſe to interpret it) of *Paul*, afreſh baptize them; and herein you condemne the concurrent

rent judgement of all ancient and moderne orthodox Divines, who have made the Baptiſme of Heretiques, and the Baptiſme by Heretiques, when the forme of adminiſtration is duly held, to be valid.

Mr. Blackwood.

FOr the *Propoſition*, it appeares, Act. 19. 2, 3, 4. *When certain that were not well inſtructed in Chriſtianity, had baptized ſome Diſciples, but had not baptized them into the name of the Holy Ghoſt: and it is probable by* Pauls *ſpeech, verſ.* 4. *that they were not baptized ſo much as into the name of Ieſus Chriſt, but only into the name of one God. Hence their Baptiſme being defective in beleeving in ſome of the perſons of the Trinity, they counted their Baptiſme not to be ſufficient, and ſo had a right Baptiſme in the name of the Lord Ieſus. Neither was this a needleſſe ſcruple of Conſcience in them, for* Paul *did approve it,* verſ. 6. *by laying his hands on them; How much more then is Baptiſme of Infants inſufficient, that doe not beleieve in any Perſon of the Trinity. Neither let any man ſay, this was a relation of* Paul *concerning* Johns *hearers in the time of* Johns *miniſtery; ſo that this word* (They) *muſt have reference unto thoſe hearers, and not a relation of* Paul *concerning an act done by* John: *it plainly appears, becauſe the Apoſtle goes on in a continued hiſtory concerning the twelve, to* ver. 8. *for they that* Paul *laid his hands on, and received the Holy Ghoſt, and ſpake with tongues,* verſ. 6. *muſt needs be meant,* verſ. 4, 5.

Anſwer.

IF in all probability they were thus baptized, not in the name of *Jeſus Chriſt*, but of one God only; then in all certainty there is no force left in your Argument. The defect in their Baptiſme was in the undue *forme* uſed by the *baptizers*, not in the *faith* of the perſons that were *baptized*. And there is nothing in the Text, that can prevaile with Interpreters to be of your mind, that they were rebaptized.

The twelve diſciples of Epheſus, *Act.* 19. not rebaptized.

1. Here is no cenſure given, or brand laid on their former Baptiſme; nor any worſe ſpoken, than that it was the Baptiſme of *John*, which was one and the ſame ſubſtantially with our Baptiſme, unleſſe the Baptiſme of Chriſt and of his members doth ſubſtantially differ.

2. Here

2. Here is not a word of *re-baptiſme*, or that the ſecond (as you account it) in oppoſition to the firſt, was a right and full Baptiſme. And that interpretation which you (after your manner) caſt off ſo ſlightly, being oppoſite to your ſingular opinion, is that which fully cleares the Text from all difficulties, and is moſt conſonant with the whole ſpeech there delivered, viz. that the particle *they*, twice mentioned in 5. verſe, hath reference to *Pauls* relation concerning the hearers of *John Baptiſt*, and not *Lukes* relation of *Pauls* proceeding with theſe twelve Diſciples at *Epheſus*. Read the Text it ſelfe, the 3. 4. and 5. verſes. *Paul ſaid unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they ſaid, unto Johns baptiſme. Then ſaid Paul, John verily baptized with the baptiſme of repentance, ſaying unto the people, that they ſhould beleeve on him who ſhould come after him, that is, on Chriſt Jeſus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jeſus.* See here how fully the 4. and 5. verſes one anſwer another: *Hearing* hath a full relation to *Saying:* John *ſaid*, (as the Text hath it) and they *heard:* they were therefore *Johns* hearers. Marke further what *John ſaid*, and what the Text ſaith, *theſe men did. John* ſaid, they muſt beleeve on him that ſhould come after him, that is, on *Chriſt Jeſus*; Theſe *hearing* were baptized in the name of the *Lord Jeſus*. If you can ſhew a like agreement of the Text with your interpretation, we ſhall further look into it. If their Baptiſme had been inſufficient by reaſon of any defect in their faith concerning the perſon of the Holy Ghoſt, St. *Paul* would have inſtructed them in that Article, before their ſecond Baptiſme: but here is no ſuch word, that they heard any thing from his mouth of this perſon of the Trinitie, but of the *Lord Jeſus*. The reaſon which in the cloſe of your Diſcourſe you render, holds forth ſo full a contradiction, that we need to take little paines to examine it. The fourth and fifth verſes (you ſay) *meane one and the ſame men:* But in the 4. verſe without all controverſie *Paul* relates a ſpeech of *John* to his hearers: The 5. verſe (according to your ſelfe) muſt therefore be underſtood of *Johns* hearers, and not of theſe twelve diſciples; of the *baptiſme* of *Johns* hearers, and not of the *re-baptiſme* of theſe perſons. And though the whole of your ſingular interpretation were granted, yet your cauſe had gained nothing. If a fundamentall errour in the Faith make voyd the Baptiſme of thoſe, in whom

a right and untainted Faith is required; Yet it followes not, that it makes voyd the Baptisme of those that are uncapable of actuall Faith, and in whom (as we heard) it is not expected or ever required. That want of Faith which you can possibly conceive to make Baptisme insufficient, is that which is *privative*, and not meerly *negative*, so that there is foure termes in your Syllogisme: *Want of Faith* is taken *privatively in your Major*, and *negatively in your Minor*; or else your Minor Proposition is to be denied, There is no *privative* want of Faith in Infants; *Privation is the want of a habit that is required and ought to be in the subject.*

Privatio est carentia habitus debiti in esse.

Mr. Blackwood.

Arg. 8.

Storm of Antichrist, p. 13.

THe same condition and qualifications are required in persons baptisable in our daies, as were required in times of the Apostles. But to have put on Christ, to be baptized into Christs death, to have the heart sprinkled from an evill conscience, to be buried and risen againe with Christ, to have the answer of a good conscience, were the conditions then required.

Therefore such conditions and qualifications are required in our dayes.

Answer.

THe Proposition that you are to prove, is, *That it is unlawfull to baptize Infants*: And neither the word *Infant*, nor *Unlawfull*, much lesse *that Infants Baptisme is unlawfull*, is to be found in all your Argument. You are ever upon the same fallacie of *Ignoratio Elenchi*. We might here (as in many other places) let you alone, seeing you have mistaken the *wall of your Garrison*, we suffer no losse in the Cause, though you enjoy your Conclusion.

Ibid. p. 14.

For the Assumption, it appeares, Rom. 6. 3, 4 *Know you not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, (that is, the name, doctrine, and profession of Christ, the badge of Christianity, Christian worship, Christian religion) were baptized into his death?*

Answ. Qualifications of persons baptizable.

Here you reckon up the qualifications of persons baptizable in the Apostles dayes; which (it seemes) you take for granted, are incompatible with Infancie: which yet being understood with your own comment in your parenthesis, may all of them well stand with

with that age and condition. Infants are baptized into the *Name, Doctrine, and Profession of Christ*: they have the *badge of Christianity, Christian Worship, and Christian Religion.* The Jewes were an *Holy Nation, a Royall Priesthood*; *they were a people that had God nigh unto them in all things in which they called upon him*: to them *appertained the Adoption, and the Glory, and the Covenants, and the giving of the Law and the Promises*: Phrases as incompatible with Infancie, as these which you reckon up from the Apostle; and yet Infants were of that body, and Sacramentally incorporated into that people. Your selfe acknowledge the benefit of salvation which Infants have by Christs death; and why may they not then be baptized into his death? *Of them is the Kingdome of Heaven*; which you doe not deny, but that it *includes the state of the Church upon Earth.* Their names are therefore to be taken, and they are to be inrolled as the subjects of his Kingdome. So that I conclude, The *same qualifications are required of persons baptizeable in our dayes, as were required in the times of the Apostles*: But the qualifications then required, and by *Mr. Blackwood* reckoned up, are compatible with Infancie. *Ergo, &c.*

Exod. 19. 6. Deut. 4 7. Rom. 9. 4.

Pag. 11. & 66.

Mr. Blackwood.

Arg. 9.

THat Tenent which brings mischiefes to the Churches, and the contrary practice, benefits; the practising of the one is unlawfull, and the contrary practice required.

Storm of Antichrist, p. 15.

But the Baptisme of Infants brings mischiefs to the Churches, and the delaying Baptisme till persons believe, brings benefit.

Therefore the practising of Infants Baptisme is unlawfull, and the contrary practice required.

Answer.

THe Proposition you say is undoubted; but you, of all other men, have reason to make some doubt of it, seeing all the list of mischiefs (seemingly to you such) which you heap up to make good your Assumption, were undeniably in the Church of the Jews through *Circumcision* of Infants, as well as in the Churches of Christ by their *Baptisme*: Yet there were reasons prevailing with the wisdome of God to appoint it and continue it. You imagine

no ſmall miſchiefs to come unto the Churches by *Compulſion* (as you call it) *of Conſcience*, as appeares by your heap of Reaſons brought againſt it: yet that which you thus brand, in the Old Teſtament was the command of God, and practiſe of renowned Princes, with ſingular approbation of the Holy Ghoſt. The carriage of things in ſo independent a way in particular Congregations, that there can be no further redreſſe, or othermanner of Authoritative cognizance of the cauſe, is not without ſingular inconveniences, leſſe than thoſe you will call miſchiefes: One Paſtor ſhall be depoſed for *Baptiſme of Infants*, another for *oppoſing it*: One ſhall be depoſed for *affirming originall ſinne*, another for *the deniall of it*. And it muſt be confeſſed, that there may be inconveniences, (or as you terme, miſchiefs) which yet other counterpoyſing circumſtances may make neceſſary to be introduced and continued. There is a *majus* and *minus* in inconveniencies, or miſchiefs: Wiſe Lawgivers digeſt the leſſer, to avoyd the greater; and the wiſdome of God is beſt able to judge; our ſafeſt way in his ordinances, is to enquire at his mouth, and not to examine the ſequell, or ballaſt them in the deceitfull ſcale of our reaſon; Such circumſtances excepted, which are left to Chriſtian prudence. And what I ſay of miſchiefs, the ſame is true of benefits.

Ibid. p. 15. The Aſſumption hath two branches:

1. *That Infants Baptiſme brings miſchiefs.*

2. *That the delaying of Baptiſme till perſons believe, brings benefits. I will ſhew the miſchiefes which Infants Baptiſme brings.*

Anſw. And thoſe doubtleſſe as many, and as foule, as ill will can make them.

Ibid. Suppoſed miſchiefes in the Baptiſme of Infants.

1. *It fils the Church with rotten members; Such perſons in following times growing up, prove often wicked, and many of them only civill men; We know not how to get them out of Communion: and ſo the matter of the Churches come to be ſo corrupted, that they are made uncapable of reformation; for when the matter of Churches is rotten, what hope is there that the Churches will come into a pure ſtate? Better did the* Nicene Councell, *that divided their Congregations into Hearers,* Catechumeni, *or perſons catechiſed, and Communicants. The mixt multitude were hearers, hopefull perſons, that had good deſires, were* Catechumeni; *and thoſe that were deemed believers, were Communicants.*

1. Hath

1. Hath not the Church a way, when they appeare rotten for the lopping of them off? *Anſ.* 1 Cor. 5. 13.

2. What Scripture way can you find to prevent them? ſuppoſe Baptiſme (according to your deſire) were delayed till profeſſion, and upon profeſſion, the party ſtraightway ſhould be received the ſame day to Baptiſme, which is Scripture way to growne perſons, would not then as many rotten ones obtrude themſelves?

3. Baptiſme (according to moſt of thoſe of your opinion for Church diſcipline) makes no member, but an after admiſſion.

4. We find not by experience rottenneſſe of members by your way prevented, they that will follow the Apoſtles Canon, *To withdraw themſelves from every brother that walketh diſorderly*, muſt not accompany many members of your new formed Churches, ſome Congregations (where your way is ſet up in the delay of Baptiſme) rather take themſelves to be *drained* then *ſifted*, not the flower and creame, but the droſſe and rubbiſh hath thus forſaken them, ſuch that have been, and doe continue noted *drunkards, and tipling-houſe haunters*, groſly failing in relation duties, living in ſloathfullneſſe, ſcandalouſly unjuſt in their dealings, ſuch as theſe make up almoſt the whole of ſome new formed, and new baptized Congregations. For your applauſe of the *Nicene-Councell* dividing their Congregations into ſeverall portions, I deſire to know whether you prefer this method of that Councell, or the way of the twelve divinely inſpired, and the way of *Philip*, *Paul*, and *Sylas*, as it is recorded in the *Acts* of the *Apoſtles*, and whether they followed this method, I appeale to your ſelfe to determine.

2. *It confounds the World and the Church together, which Chriſt hath ſevered*, Joh. 15. 19. Joh. 17. 9, 14, 15. *Infants Baptiſme eſpecially ſerving to chriſtianize the prophane world, who if men enlightned would ſpeake what they thinke, they muſt needs ſay they are not Chriſtians, no not one tenth part in too too many Cangregations.* *Ibid.* pa. 16.

I Pray into what Church were theſe taken whom Chriſt by his choyce, ſevered from the world? were they not taken into the Church of the Jewes? And if that were a State ſevered from the world, I hope our Infants are in a Church ſevered from the world likewiſe, did theſe make a viſible Church diſtinct from others, or were they rather the elect of God taken out of nature into grace? *Anſ.*

you tell your objector of *Paralogiſmes*, if he doe not know them, you will teach him the uſe of them.

Ibid. pa. 16. 3. *It cauſes reproch to Chriſtianity, when many perſons that have been chriſtianized only by their Infants Baptiſme, prove ſo unholy, which heathens look on as part of you.*

Anſ. So did the lives of the *Iſraelites*, which yet you will not charge upon circumciſion, though they ſhould remaine unbaptized, the reproch would be no leſſe, being the off-ſpring of Chriſtians, and how would heathens inſult, that when Chriſtians did ſo deteſt them, yet they reſt contented that their poſterity ſhould be of them? Gods way be taken to take the reproch from his name.

Ezek. 36. 20.

Ibid. 4. *Wicked perſons reſt in the Baptiſme they had in their infancy without ſeeking after knowledge or grace.*

Anſ. So they will in their Baptiſme received at the age of *Iudas*, *Symon Magus*, *Himyneus*, &c. It is the worke of the Miniſtery as it was of the Prophets, and *Iohn Baptiſt* to beat downe theſe ſelfe flatterers.

Ibid. 5. *Its a neſt-egge and ground-work for traditions; if we fall upon traditionary teachers, preſently they hit us in the teeth with Infants Baptiſme.* Bellarmine *ſaith, the Lutherans cannot prove the Baptiſme of Infants againſt the Anabaptiſts by the Scripture, the Catholiks are not wont.*

Anſ. This you quote with as good a conſcience as *Bellarmine* wrote, though he ſpeakes thus when he writes for traditions, yet you know (I am ſure you have been told) that when he is to deale againſt the Anabaptiſts, he can quit traditions, and prove it from Scriptures. *Satis aperte colligitur ex Scripturis*: So *Eckius* he makes it a tradition alſo, yet with *Bellarmine* can diſpute by Scripture arguments to defend it, you ſeeme to ſtand for *the Lords* day, here you will be to told by ſome of traditions, you are for the *degrees prohibited for marriage* as being ſtill in force; Here *Bellarmine* will tell you that it is no Law of the Scriptures in the New Teſtament, but only the Churches authority, and it is as eaſie worke to defend the *lawfullneſſe of Infants Baptiſme*, as to maintaine the evill of thoſe *forbidden degrees*, for your inſtance in the words of *Iohn Baptiſt*, *it is not lawfull for thee to have thy brothers wife*, your adverſary will tell you that *Philip* was then alive, as appeares from *Luk.* 3. 1. together with the *teſtimony* of *Iosephus*. For the other inſtance of the

Bellar. *de ſacrament. bap. cap.* 8. *Non obligant jure divino Chriſtianos præcepta omnia quæ de gradibus habentur in Levitico. Recte Catholica Eccleſia conjugia prohibuit ad quartum gradum conſanguinitatis et affinitatis.* Bel. *de ſacrament. matr. cap.* 29.

inceſtuous

incestuous Corinth, he will answer the same thing, the Father whose wife the soone tooke was alive, what else meane those words? *Wherefore though I wrote unto you, I did it not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that,* &c. 2 Cor. 7. 12. Who was he that suffered the wrong but the father? who had cause of complaint in the words of *Jacob* concerning *Ruben, he went up to my Couch,* We must not bogg at Tenents, as soon as *Papists* for their owne ends can cry traditions. Gen. 44. 4.

6. *It fills the conscience with scruples.* Ibid. pa. 16.

And is it not your worke to buz them, and hold such as you lead captive in them? Ans.

Some question whether they were ever baptised. Ibid.

Pretended scruples bred by the baptisme of infants.

And with as good reason as *Paul* might question, whether *he were circumcised the eighth day, that he was of the stocke of* Israel, *an* Hebrew *of the* Hebrews, *of the tribe of* Benjamin, *the sonne of a* Phatisee: with as good reason, as you may question whether your name be *Ch.* or *Blackwood*, you have no more assurance that you were the child of such and such parents, we might tell you of being chang'd in the cradle: If testimonies of this nature in matter of fact will not serve, the King can claime no Crowne, nor his subjects any inheritance, The *Register* was enough to make good the *pedigree of the Priests* to hold their function, and if there should once in the world happen such an unheard of, and morally impossible errour, you know it is not the want of Baptisme but the neglect, or contempt, that is of danger, and ignorance of the fact, if invincible excuses from sinne. Ans. Ezra. 2. 62. Neh. 7. 64.

Some question how could I make a covenant by my selfe, much lesse by others, being an Infant? Ibid.

Every smatterer in the Law, or Countrie Copyholder will satisfie them, an infant inrolled in Court as Tenant, is *ipso facto*, interested in priviledges, and obliged to duty and services, their *inrollment* is a reall Covenant, unlesse they disclaime their inheritance, so it is with an infant in Baptisme. Ans.

Some think there is no word at all for what is here done. Ibid.

These, if they please, may find a word for their satisfaction. Ans.

Some thinke it a signe of faith in present, others in infants. Ibid.

I cannot understand the meaning of these mens thoughts. Ans.

But that which causeth most scruple, is about the formalis ratio, Ibid.

the

the formall cauſe that inrights a man to this Infant Baptiſme. Some thinke the faith of the parents, or of thoſe that offer them, doth inright them hereto; Others think that the faith of their Grand-father, great-grandfather to many generations, if none be neerer that were godly of the race, the faith of Noah *ſhall ſerve.*

Anſw. You might have done well to have told us who thoſe ſome be that have many of thoſe wild thoughts in their heads, for my ſelfe I never heard of ſeverall of them. The Schoolmen indeed out of an erroneous conceit of the efficacie of Baptiſme, have hunted up ſome queſtions, how an Infant is ſaved by the parents faith; but that conceit being exploded, Baptiſme and Juſtification being knowne to be two diſtinct things, for ought I know in this there is a generall agreement, Whereas to render the Tenent odious, you ſay, *talke with ten men, and you ſhall ſee them divided into five parts,* I know not the man who is capable of diſcourſe of this kind, that differs from me in this particular in his judgement, and what that is the Reader may ſee, *Bir. Pr.* pa. 26. 27. *God* is one party in the Covenant, *the beleever* and his ſeed the other, when the beleever aſſents to the promiſe with a faith Dogmaticall, ſo as to make profeſſion, he and his are intereſſed in the priviledge.

Infants Baptiſme deſtroyes two of the prnicipall markes of a particular Church.

Ibid. p. 17. 1. *Profeſſion: that which makes us members of the Catholike, I meane Chriſts body, the profeſſion hereof makes us members of a particular Church, faith doth the one, and the profeſſion of faith doth the other, now Infants Baptiſme utterly deſtroyes this note.*

Anſw. The profeſſion of ſuch a faith that can make no member of Chriſts body, is yet ſufficient to make a member of the viſible Church, a *Dogmaticall faith* is enough for the one, *the faith of the elect* ſerves only for the other; I pray tell us into what particular Church the *Eunuch*, *Act.* 8. 37. was received? of what Congregationall aſſembly was he made a member by his Baptiſme? was it of a Church *Ethiopian*? or rather *Vtopian*? whereas (in your parentheſis) you explode *a Catholike viſible Church as a monſter*, ſo will others with far better reaſon, your Baptiſme into particular Churches, name one perſon baptized *by approbation of officers and people*, ſo to be made a particular Church member: concerning an Univerſall viſible Church more hereafter.

2. *Infants*

2. *Infants Baptiſme, deſtroyes Baptiſme from being a marke of a Church—— Infants Baptiſme is no diſtinguiſhable ſigne, or mark of a member of a Church; becauſe it is common to more perſons, then ſuch as by Church right are members of Churches, even to many that aſſoon as they grow up, become perſecutors of beleeving members, of the ſame Church of which the perſecutors themſelves are reputed members.* Ibid. p. 17.

How groſly faulty is this argument, Some Infants after Baptiſme prove perſecutors. Therefore by Baptiſme, and before perſecution, they are no Church members. *Anſw.*

1. They may fall (I ſuppoſe) from right of membership of particular Churches, otherwiſe *Profeſſion* is no mark for after profeſſion, they may become Apoſtates, *Faith* is no marke, beleevers may make ſhipwrack of their faith, and become hereticks. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19.

2. Perſecutors in their heat of perſecution, may be viſible members, you will not ſay that Saint *Paul* ſpake contradictions, when he ſpake *of perils of falſe brethren*, If *Paul* were in perill by them they were *perſecutors*, and they had been no *brethren*; if they had been no *Church members*, You your ſelfe in your friendly admonition to your objector, *pag.* 67. Riſe yet higher, where you ſay, *one godly man may perſecute another.* 2 *Cor.* 11. 26.

8. *It makes the preachers aſſertion of Baptiſme, and the peoples practicalls, to jarr one with another; and here you furniſh us with a heap of aſſertions from ſeverall renowned Divines*, as Melancton, Zanchy, Martyr, Polanus, Bucan, Greenham, Willet, Muſculus, Trelcatius, *To which heap many like aſſertions you ſay may be added*, pag. 19. Ibid.

The greater the heap, the more is your cauſe weakened, is it not a marvell that ſo many eminent Divines induſtrious in the ſtudy of this Argument, ſhould ſo unanimouſly jarr with their owne principles, and not be able to diſcerne it? but all thoſe many muſt leave it to you to diſcover it, you quote indeed their words, but doe not ſo much as hint where the jarr hits, The Readers ſee a ſingular *harmony*, as did thoſe Divines, (doubtleſſe) and no diſcord, All the poſſible diſcord or colour is in this, that Baptiſme in theſe aſſertions is made a ſigne, or ſeale of ſome grace, whereof infancy is not capable, This I beleeve with you makes the jarr; but the reconciliation is eaſie, There is in Baptiſme two parts, an outward, and an in- *Anſw.*

ward, a double benefit proportionably anſwering.

1. An outward benefit, which is, initiation into Church-ſociety, and participation of Church-priviledges, there was a dayly addition to the Churches, and Baptiſme was the way of addition; When a Diſciple was made, he was ever thus received, this benefit both Infants, and growne Perſons have by Baptiſme, though the outward putting away the filth of the fleſh, do not ſave, yet it intitles to ſaving Ordinances.

2. An inward benefit, which is the thing ſignified in Baptiſme, *the blood and Spirit of Chriſt*, with the fruits, and effects of both *Iuſtication, and Sanctification*, of which Infants are capable by the immediate worke of God, otherwiſe in infancy they were not ſaveable; In growne perſons it is wrought, and increaſed, as faith is wrought by improvement of this, and other Ordinances, So that Baptiſme which is paſt in the act when we were Infants, remaines ſtill in the uſe, and office. Our Baptiſme received then, is a ſigne, ſeal, and pledge now, being a ſigne and ſeal of *grace, to be wrought in future*, and not only of *grace already wrought in us*, as you teach in your Catechiſme, *anſ.* 3.

Ibid. p. 19. Suppoſed abſurdities following upon the Baptiſme of Infants.

9. *Infants Baptiſme produces many abſurdities.*

Anſw.

1. *It puts Infants in a ſtate of grace, and remiſſion of ſins before calling.*

Ibid.

I had thought neither you nor we had beleeved ſuch an *opus operatum* in Baptiſme, as thus to work grace, and remiſſion of ſins; it preſupoſes indeed a capacitie of ſuch grace in infancy.

2. *It makes them viſible members of Chriſts Church before calling, contrary to* 1. Cor. 1. 2.

Anſ.

If you meane *effectuall calling according to Gods purpoſe*, there are many ſuch among your owne baptized ones, there ever hath been ſuch, and this is the calling, which uſually runs in your heads, though it be not the *calling* that the Scripture you quote mentions, and Infants are not members before all calling, they are called with their parents to this priviledge, many of them according to your ſelfe are effectually called having a *miſticall union with Chriſt*, yea all dying Infants, ſeeing all are ſaved that dye in infancy in your opinion, All of them have a viſible calling.

Ibid.

3. *It upholds a Nationall Church as circumciſion did, The Nationall Church is but one Candleſtick, the particular Churches are ſeven Candleſticks,* Apoc. 1. 20.

1. There

1. There are thoſe that do baptize Infants, who are not for Nationall Churches. *Anſ.*

2. Circumciſion upheld no Nationall Church, Infants were circumciſed in *Iſrael* 400 yeares before any Nationall Church was known among them.

3. Tell me how there can be a *Nation of Diſciples*, and not a *Nationall Church* that the *Kingdomes of the earth become the Kingdomes of our Lord*, and yet are no Churches, If *Diſciples in a family* make a Church, *Diſciples in a Kingdome* make up one likewiſe. *Rev.11.15.* *Rom.16.5.* *Philem.2.*

4. One particular Church is but one Candleſtick, and if one Nationall Church be one Candleſtick, then ſeven Nationall Churches are ſeven Candleſticks.

4. *It intailes grace to generation, not to regeneration, contrary to* Ioh.3.5,6. *Ibid.pa.19.*

In what way grace is intailed by Baptiſme to *generation*, and not to *regeneration*, you doe not ſhew, if it be on ſuppoſition of their priviledge by birth, ſee a full anſwer, *B. P. pag.*13.14. *Anſ.*

5. *It goes quite contrary to Chriſts order, who firſt bids make Diſciples, and then baptize them after.* *Ibid.*

In Scripture dialect they are Diſciples before their Baptiſme. *Anſ.*

6. *Hereby the Carnall ſeed is taken, and acknowledged to be the Spirituall ſeed of* Abraham. *Ibid.*

And is not the *Rockie ground* often with you taken for *good ground* when ſuch are baptized? In reference to Baptiſme, we know an outward right in the eye of the Church is ſufficient. *Anſ.*

7. *Whereas the Scripture requires only perſons to be baptized, who gladly receive the Word,* Act.2.41. *and deſire Baptiſme,* Act.8.36. *by this infant Baptiſme, all are compelled, they and their children to be made Chriſtians, whether they will or no.* *Ibid.*

Onely is not in the Text, but it is your addition; and it is more than ſtrange, that Infants baptiſme ſhould compell Parents to be Chriſtians: *Compulſion* is againſt heart, and Infants themſelves have no *heart-riſing* againſt their Baptiſme. *Anſ.*

8. *Chriſt did never ordaine the Sacrament of Baptiſme any way to concurre towards grace, but as it works in, by, and upon the underſtanding: Then it is an abſurdity to diſpenſe it where there is no underſtanding to conceive the hiſtorie, or myſterie thereof.* *Ibid.*

Anſw. This hath already received a ſufficient anſwer, where the ſuppoſed jars betwixt the aſſertion of Divines, and their practiſe, was reconciled.

Pag. 41,42.

Ibid. p. 19. 9. *Infants Baptiſme is a foundation for the Arminians to maintaine falling from grace. If Infants be baptized becauſe they are in covenant with God; then it ſeemes they after proving wicked, are fallen away. This Argument was urged by the* Remonſtrants, *which Doctor* Ames *was forced to ſlight, becauſe he could not anſwer.*

Anſw. And doe all that you baptize, neceſſarily perſevere? or in caſe they fall away, doth your Baptiſm maintaine the *apoſtacie of the Saints?* What anſwer ſoever you make, we ſhall come in under it: And now I know the reaſon of your laughter, that *the Infants of beleevers are* (in Scripture-language) *Diſciples*; viz. becauſe you are not able to anſwer.

Ibid. 10. *Many by Infants Baptiſme are received into communion of Baptiſme, who are excluded from the communion in the Lords Supper: Whereas the communion in both is one and the ſame, which I prove by foure Reaſons.*

Anſw. 1. Are not many injured, when they are refuſed? What warrant to deny a baptized perſon the Lords Supper, who is qualified with knowledge, and manifeſts no ſcandall in his life, for want of ſuch membership of which Scripture is ſilent?

2. Many are admitted to the Lords Table at one time, who are juſtly excluded at another, and yet the Communion is ſtill the ſame. For your diſcourſe and reaſons for *ſameneſſe in Communion in both Sacraments:* In ſubſtance we grant it, we have Chriſt in both, though in the way of diſpenſation they are different; otherwiſe the Sacrament would be the ſame, as well as the Communion. One is the *Sacrament of our initiation*, to which we are admitted as ſoon as we have the honour to be called Chriſtians, or to be accounted one of that fellowſhip: In this we may be meerly *paſſive*, as infants were in Circumciſion, which was the Sacrament of their initiation, by your own grant, as Baptiſme is of ours. The other is the Sacrament of our *growth and confirmation*, in which we are *active*, both the outward and inward man are to be imployed. In Baptiſme therefore the action is wholy the baptizers, *I baptize thee:* it is done *upon the baptized*, and nothing done *by the baptized.*

tized. In the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, both the *Adminiſtrant* and the *Communicant* are agents, one to deliver, the other to receive. Though animadverſions might be made on ſeverall parts of the diſcourſe, yet I ſhall forbeare, as not much pertinent to our preſent purpoſe.

I will now prove the ſecond branch of the Aſſumption, that is this, The delaying Baptiſme till perſons beleeve, brings benefits, As Ibid p. 22.

1. *Hereby the matters of the Churches will be right, whiles none but Saints in profeſſion ſhall be admitted members: and without a right matter there will never be comfortable Reformation.*

New attempts ever carry along with them big promiſes: but wiſe men will be *ſober and miſtruſtfull:* here in ſpeciall it concernes them, ſeeing the buſineſſe is of conſequence, and the experiment (as well of the preſent as the former age, in our own, and forraigne Nations) hath found it to be far otherwiſe. And if you will take *Saints in profeſſion*, not in your own, but Scripture-ſenſe, you will not be holpen at all by this benefit. But this we ſhall after examine. Anſw.

2. *Perſons being delayed, will be carefull to get knowledge, that ſo they may partake of Church-priviledges, and without which they cannot partake of them; and alſo to addreſſe their lives according to the rule of Chriſtianity, ſeeing a want of either would keep them off from being Church-members.* Ibid.

VVould it not rather provoke them to *deſpiſe knowledge*, & perſecute them who againſt the free charter of Heaven, and preſcription of all Ages, deny them their right of priviledge? To keep a man off from all Chriſtian communion (contrary to all precedents of former Ages) is a ſtrange way to make men in love with Chriſtian Religion. Anſw.

But what if a perſon ſhould die in the time when he is delayed? Object.

That is an Objection not worth the making or anſwering; put it in other termes, and then we ſhall further expect your anſwer of it: *What if they die in the time in which by reaſon of the wrath of God that they lie under, they are unbaptizable?* Anſ.

3. *Miniſters and Chriſtians would have a more perfect underſtanding of the doctrine of Baptiſme, which being adminiſtred to Infants, ſeems to be under a cloud.* Ibid.

Anſw. I hope, Miniſters and Chriſtians competently inſtructed in the principles of Religion, have that meaſure of knowledge, that this Treatiſe, or others of like kind, will make little addition. And they would yet be more cleare, were it not for the clouds that you draw over it; and your uſe of Scripture words, viz. *Beleevers, Saints, Calling, &c.* clean againſt the ſenſe of Scriptures.

Your fourth pretended Benefit is your twelfth Argument, where it is to be examined.

Ibid. p. 23. 5. *Deferring Baptiſme would take off ſcruples from godly Miniſters, who ſcruple the giving the Lords Supper to ungodly civill perſons, and not without cauſe, being,* 1. *They beare falſe witneſſe to them, aſſerting the body of Chriſt to be given for them;* 2. *Give them a knife wherewith they know they will cut their own throats: now if theſe ſhould profeſſe the faith in words, and not deny it in deeds, before they were baptized, by vertue of the ſame profeſſion they might be admitted to the Supper, without any more adoe.*

Anſw. If they beare falſe witneſſe to ſuch men in that aſſertion; yet I hope the Apoſtle *Peter* ſpeaks nothing but truth, where he ſaith, 2 Pet. 2. 1. that the *falſe teachers bring in damnable hereſies, denying the Lord that bought them.* The price wherewith theſe are ſaid to be bought, is no other than the *body and blood* that is there ſaid to be given. And how are you without ſcruple, according to your own principles, that give a knife to ſuch, of whom you doubt whether they will feed, or murder themſelves with it? And while you pretend to quit godly Miniſters of ſcruples, I pray take heed of multiplying them. If the delivery of the Sacrament to any that unworthily receives it, riſes to that guilt which your language expreſſes, all Miniſteriall diſpenſation of it in a Church that is moſt right in the world, will prove the greateſt of ſnares. And ſeeing you here undertake ſo happy a work as the clearing of Miniſters conſciences in this buſineſſe from ſcruples, I pray you let us have ſome more of your help, what courſe, according to Scripture rule, they are to take; You ſay that, *Pag.* 21. *that which is called a leſſe excommunication, conſiſting in an abſtention of vitious men from the Supper, and yet holding them in communion in other priviledges, hath (ſo far as you ſee) little ground in Scripture.* And in your following words it is evident, that you ſuppoſe there is no other way of keeping back a member, but *excommunication.* Now we ſee

in

in Scripture, how high the evill was before an excommunication paſſed: we find two notable hereticks, and one in *fornication exceeding what had been heard among the Heathen*, excommunicate, and none, that I know, for any inferior crime. You note our civill perſons, of knowledge, as not to be admitted, when yet I think that you ſcarce beleeve that theſe (according to Scripture patterne) ſhould be excommunicated. For our redreſſe, it ſeems, there is no way left, but to diſchurch all Congregations, and to begin *de novo* to receive members: ſo the *Churches* muſt be *new Churched*, and the *Chriſtians Chriſtianized*: And this muſt be either by *Baptiſme*, or elſe they muſt be let into Church-communion at ſome other doore. In your Tract we can ſcarce know your mind; ſometimes you ſpeak of admiſſion *by Baptiſme*, as in the *Eunuchs* caſe; ſometimes by *Covenant after Baptiſme*, which you would make to be the way of *Pauls* admiſſion. For Baptiſme, we know that it immediately followed upon Converſion, the ſame day, if not the ſame houre they were baptized. We read of *ſingle perſons, of families, of ſeverall thouſands, of Cities and Countries*, (the generality of them I mean) baptized upon their firſt profeſſion to believe: we read not of one, upon deſire of Baptiſme, denyed, nor ſo much as an Interrogatory put to them concerning their perſonall qualification. And I think there is not any perſon in Scripture mentioned whoſe baptiſme after his converſion was deferred for the ſpace of a day, *Paul* excepted, who waited indeed three dayes, and baptiſme to him was adminiſtred, as ſoon as a Miniſter was found to diſpenſe it and before either ſtrength or opportunity to be dipped. I would have you to judge whether this way of admiſſion will help us to a right matter of Churches. What further way of help you will lend us, we are yet in expectation. The Scripture way of Baptiſme, though it were adminiſtred to men of yeares, will but little advantage us. And by this time I hope you ſee, that neither the miſchiefes that you have pretended, have done our cauſe any miſchiefe, nor the benefits which you have alleadged, brought to your own way any advantage: Therefore I conclude,

That which brings upon the Church many miſchiefs, with the addition of more abſurdities, and withall hinders the Church of ſeverall benefits; that (you ſay) is not to be ſuffered:

But this charge of bringing miſchiefes, and abſurdities, and hindring

hindring benefits being laid upon Infants Baptiſme you ſee, is found to be as falſe as foule. Therefore this charge notwithſtanding the Baptiſme of Infants is lawfull.

Mr. Blackwood.

Arg. 10.

Storm of Antichriſt, *p.* 23.

THat Tenent which was firſt taken up in the Churches, upon unſound and erroneous principles is unlawfull.

But ſo was Infants Baptiſme, therefore its unlawfull; I prove the aſſumption, in that it was brought in upon theſe grounds, or ſuch like.

1. *That Baptiſme did waſh away originall ſinne,* ſo Orig. in c. 6. ad Roma. *ſaith the Church received a tradition from the Apoſtles, to give Baptiſme to Infants, for they to whom the ſecrets of Divine myſteries were committed, knew that they were in all the naturall filth of ſinne, which ought to be aboliſhed by Water, and the Spirit.*

Anſwer.

Corrupt principles the pretended grounds of infants baptiſme.

I Pray did *Origen* ſpeak by way of propheſie upon what grounds Baptiſme of Infants many yeers after his time ſhould be received? In the next page but one you ſay, *ſome Chriſtians out of worldly wiſdome and a wearineſſe to ſuffer, you doubt not about the times of* Auſtin, *or a little before brought the Baptiſme of Infants into the Church.* Now *Origen* was 200 yeares *Auſtins* ancient, how could *Origen* then tell upon what grounds it was received? I pray you lay your hand upon your heart, whether you doe not contend farre more for an *opinion* then for truth, *Origen* with you is a competent witneſſe that Baptiſme of Infants was brought into the Church upon corrupt grounds, but he muſt be no witneſſe that it was at all in being in his time, You have ſure heard of that Logick rule, *A propoſitione ſecundæ adiacentis, ad propoſitionem primæ adjacentis valet argumentum,* If it be true that *Socrates* is a learned man, then it is true that *Socrates* is a man; if more then forty entred a conſpiracy againſt *Paul*, then there was a conſpiracy; If *Origen* tell us upon what grounds it did enter, then he is a competent witneſſe, that it was then actually entred.

Ibid. *p.* 23.

Hence the Counſell of Cartage. Can. 111. *Ordained children to be baptized, for the waſhing away of originall ſinne, that that Infants*

contracted

contracted by the old generation, may be purged by regeneration, by which the counsell meanes Baptisme. So the counsell of Trullo.

Doe you thinke that these *Counsells* brought in the Baptisme of Infants? *Austin* was of that of *Carthage*, and his opinion for the antiquity of Infants Baptisme is well knowne, and when you acknowledge that you know not the time when it came in, how came you then to the knowledge of the grounds, by which it was brought in? If you know not the Authors, how can you then know their motives? And the men of this judgement had the same opinion of Baptisme, of men of growne yeares, that it tooke away all sorts of sinne, both originall, and actuall, And therefore they called it the *first planke after shipwracke*, upon this ground, these men baptized men of yeares, as well as Infants, if it be therefore of any force against Baptisme of any, it is of equall force against the Baptisme of all persons. *Answ.*

2. *That Baptisme did conferre grace, hence every man was afraid his child should dye without baptisme, least it should dye without grace; hence the Papists teach, that the Sacraments, as Physicall causes effectually, actively and immediately produce, and make the grace of justification, in the heart of man. For this end the Priest according to the prescript of the Reformed Masse-booke is bound to pray, that the nature of water may receive the power of Sanctification. So in the* Scotch Service booke, *which in the beginning of these stirs was thurst upon them, there are these words, the Presbiter was to use this Petition,* Sanctifie this fountaine of Baptisme, Oh thou which art the Sanctifier of all things, Nor was our Common-prayer-book far removed from this tenet: *As appeares in the Catechisme. Who gave you that name? Answ.* My Godfathers and Godmothers in my Baptisme, wherein I was made a member of Christ the child of God, and an inheritour of Heaven. *Ibid. p. 24.*

If upon this doctrine of theirs, you cast off the Baptisme of Infants, you must together with it cast off all use of both the Sacraments, And I beleeve that you doe not thinke that those three bookes, *the reformed Masse-book, the* Scots *Service-booke, and our Common-prayer-booke*, did bring in the Baptisme of Infants. *Answ.*

3. *The third was the absolute necessitie of Baptisme to salvation,* For which the Councells of *Carthage* and *Laodicea* are brought in, and if it please the Reader to look upon the words of the Canons *Ibid. Answ.*

there quoted, he ſhall find nothing, but truth in them, one expreſſion concerning oyle (which is nothing to the preſent purpoſe) excepted, The quicke diſpatch which *the rubricke in our Engliſh Common-prayer-booke* directs the Miniſter to make in private Baptiſme, is brought in likewiſe, as though that Rubrick had brought into the world this Cuſtome, which by your owne confeſſion is a thouſand years more antient.

Ibid. 4. *For the increaſement of Chriſtendome, ſome Chriſtians out of worldly Wiſdome, and a Wearineſſe to ſuffer I doubt not about the times of* Auſtin, *or a little before brought it into the Church but only as a tradition.*

Anſw. How a wearineſſe to ſuffer, ſhould bring in Baptiſme of Infants, I cannot apprehend, did they baptize Infants out of a foreſight that being growne they would perſecute, and a care to prevent it? You ſay that after Baptiſme many of them grow perſecutors, this way of theirs could therefore be no prevention; and I hope you doe not thinke that the Apoſtles out of any ſuch principles tooke an indirect way in their ſpeedy Baptiſme of converts, for the increaſe of Chriſtendome likewiſe, I ſuppoſe the wiſdome of both is one, and neither of the world, but both of God, ſo that inſtead of miſchiefes which your former argument heaps, ſundry ſingular benefits follow upon the application of this Ordinance of Baptiſme to Infants.

Benefits following upon Infants Baptiſme.

1. As ſoon as capacity ſerves they are taught to know even by their Baptiſme to whom they belong, what maſter they are to ſerve, and in what ſchoole they are to be trained.

2. A neceſsity is ſeene to get the knowledge of Chriſt, and to walke in his wayes.

3. A delight is wrought in thoſe, in whoſe Communion they are bred, and that (walking in the way of Chriſt) owne them as theirs, Being debarr'd from ſocietie with Chriſtians, it is the way to bring them to maligne them, But being taken in to them, and indeed of them, it muſt needs occaſion delight in them, each one is apt to love his owne ſocietie, and the men of his way.

4. The aggravation of their ſinne in the miniſtery of the word, ſounds ſtill in their eares (by reaſon of the favour they receive from God, the ſocietie into which they are incorporated, and the reall covenant into which they are entred) in caſe their converſation anſwer not their profeſsion.

5. Parents

3. Parents ſee a ſtrong engagement to bring them up for Chriſt, when they have dedicated them to him, and put them into the fellowſhip of thoſe that are his Saints and Members.

And whereas you ſay that this was brought in about the times of Auſtin, *or a little before.* I wonder what thoughts you would have the world to conceive of that Father, whether we ſhould take him for a man, the moſt ignorant of all men, of the ſtate of of things in the Church, or elſe of the greateſt impudence, without all brow to bluſh at the uttering of the moſt ſhamefull and notorious untruth. Suppoſe that I ſhould affirme that the Engliſh plantation in *New-England*, in *America*, were as ancient as the *Conqueſt*, and that the Churches there ever ſince that time, had continued their way of diſcipline as it ſtands now eſtabliſhed, and by them enjoyed, Would not every youth in this caſe be ready to ſtand up in contradiction? knowing thoſe plantations to be but as of yeſterday, they bear their firſt date from ſome of the laſt yeers of King *James* his raigne, yet ſuch a ſpeech as this you put into the mouth of *Auſtin*, he lived in the fifth Century, well towards the ſame diſtance from Chriſt, as we now ſtand from the Conqueſt, and how frequently, and fully does he ſpeake of the Antiquity of Infants Baptiſme? making the Apoſtles the Authors, and the uſe of it to be from their dayes. That rule of his he applies to Infants Baptiſme. *That which the whole Church holds, and was not ordained by any Councells; but hath ever been held, that is, rightly believed to be by Apoſtolicall Authority.* And ſpeaking of this ſubject of Infants Baptiſme, let no man ſaith he ſuggeſt other Doctrine, *The Church ever hath had, this ever hath held it: This it hath received from the faith of our predeceſſours, and in this will to the end perſevere.* Further he ſaith: *The cuſtome of the Church in the Baptiſme of Infants, is by no means to be deſpiſed, or to be accounted ſuperfluous, nor yet altogether to be credited, but that it is a tradition of the Apoſtles,* A written tradition he means, as appeares by his diſpute from the written Word for it, he was a man that cannot be challenged for ignorance; being ſo ſingularly verſt in Antiquities; He that reads his books *de civitate Dei* may think that he had ſcarce his equall, no Religion of the Heathen was unknowne to him, how could he be then ignorant of the entrance of ſuch a notable innovation in his owne time, or a little before him?

De baptiſ. contra donat. l. 44. cap. 24.

De verbis apoſtoli. Sect. 10.

Ad Voluſianum Epiſt. 3.

And he that hath wrote ſo at large againſt all kind of lies (even thoſe which ſeem moſt excuſable) cannot be ſuſpected to be guilty of ſo notorious and groſſe a practiſe of it, as to father an innovation of his owne age upon the Apoſtles, And how comes it to paſſe that no writer of his age did challenge him for this impudence, nor any that immediately followed him? Why have we it not in his Retractations, or Confeſſions? Why is not this among thoſe *Nevi*, Such blemiſhes that are noted in eminent Fathers? that he uſed to let ſlip things againſt dictates of his owne conſcience, Why is it that the writers of his time, and thoſe that preſently followed him in the ſame century; affirme the ſame things with him, and inſtead of contradiction of him (which had been their duty in ſo notable an impoſture) unanimouſly agree to ſpeake the ſame things with him? As *Hierome epiſt. ad Letam. Paulinus in vita Ambroſii. Theoderetus epit. diviner. dog. cap. de Baptiſ. Genadius de eccleſiaſticis dogmat. cap.* 31. And if you will perſiſt in theſe thoughts concerning the introduction of Infants baptiſme, I hope few Readers will have the ſame thoughts with you. I let paſſe your contradiction, where you ſay, that it was received in that time as a *tradition*, when a *tradition* neceſſarily implyes a long and continued ſtanding.

Mr. Blackwood.

Arg. 12.

Storm of Antichriſt, p. 25. Antiquity concerning Baptiſme of Infants examined.

FRom the Univerſall practiſe not only in the times of the Apoſtles, but in following times wherein we find perſons only baptized after they beleeved. For the Apoſtles times we ſee, Act. 2. 38. Mark. 16. 16. Joh. 3. 5. Act. 18. 12. *&c.*

Object. *But we cannot tell out of Antiquity, when Infants Baptiſme came in, Therefore it was Apoſtollicall.*

Anſw. *We can prove out of Antiquity, when it was not in the Church, even in* Juſtin Martyrs *dayes, who is the ancienteſt Father extant that I know of who was not ſpurious, Yet it is never mentioned in his genuine workes.*

Anſwer.

YOur eleventh Argument is wanting, you were ambitious of a jury, and one appeares not, your Scripture texts for Baptiſme

iſme of Infants have been already examined, in which your particle *only* is not found, nor yet Infants excluded.

For the times following the Apoſtles we ſhall now examine,

And

1. Your allegations when Baptiſme of Infants was not.
2. Your exceptions to thoſe teſtimonies which beare witneſſe to this practiſe in theſe ages.

For your allegation from *Iuſtin Martyr*, a negative teſtimony borrowed from Authority, is the weekeſt of all arguments, There is no mention of a *Sabbath* from the fall, to *Moſes*, And that therefore in all that ſpace there was no *Sabbath*, hath been thought to be a weak inference. There is no mention of a *Sabbath* from *Moſes* time, in the books of *Joſhua*, *Judges*, *Samuel*, 1. *King*. for the ſpace of above ſix hundred yeares, and therefore in all this time there was no *Sabbath*, I am ſure is a falſe inference.

But *Juſtin Martyr* you ſay hath that which is contrary to his practiſe, where he ſaith *whoſoever are perſwaded, and beleeve thoſe things to be true which are delivered and ſpoken of us, and receive that they can ſo live, they are brought of us where there is water, and waſhed, in the name of the Father*, &c. In which words we ſee indeed enough for Baptiſme of Converts, brought from Heatheniſme to the Faith (frequent in *Juſtin Martyrs* time) but not a ſillable againſt the Baptiſme of Infants.

And therefore I wonder how Mr. M. *can uſe ſuch a confident aſſertion as he doth, when he ſaith, this priviledge of baptizing of ſuch Infants, the Chriſtian Church hath been in poſſeſſion of for the ſpace of* 1500. *yeeres and upwards; and for the confirmation hereof he brings a quotation out of this ſpurious Book falſly attributed to* Juſtin Martyr, queſt. 56. *the vanity of which Book I have ſufficiently proved.* Pag. 27.

And why doe you not more wonder at *Origen*, *Auſtin*, and *Jerome*, who lived in Ages when they could have given a more full account of ſuch an aſſertion, and might eaſily have been contradicted? And every man that reads your quotation, may wonder that you think have any thing out of *Juſtin Martyr* againſt it. *Anſw.*

For your wonder that Mr. *M.* brings a quotation out of a spurious book falsly intituled to *Justin Martyr*, two things might make you forbeare all admiration:

1. Many learned men quote this book under his name.

2. Mr. *M.* plainly enough hints to the Reader the same thing that you affirme; *In a book* (saith he) *that goes under his name*: implying sufficiently that there was cause of doubt that the book was none of *Justin Martyrs*.

The next testimonies which you bring for witnesse, when the Baptisme of Infants was not, are *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Basil*, *Chrysostome*, whose words if the Reader please to examine, he shall not find Infants once mentioned, much lesse their Baptisme denied or disavowed. And for *Basil* and *Chrysostome*, I marvell that they come in, seeing you expresly say, *pag.* 31. *That you regard not any authority after the first three hundred yeeres*; and these two are of a lower standing. For all of them joyntly together, their words are such that deny not Infants baptisme: *But their words will not well* (you think) *agree with that practise*: *If infants were baptized in their dayes, this doctrine, and that practise would jar, and* (in your opinion) *not agree together.* The same is your opinion of the doctrine of those late moderne Writers which you quote, *pag.* 18. Your argument would carry equall strength, if you should thence conclude, that the Baptisme of Infants was not in their dayes. And why might not the doctrine of those Fathers, and the peoples practice jar, as well as the doctrine of those who in our dayes and our fathers were so famous? Or rather might not those Fathers be as well able to reconcile their doctrine, and Infants baptisme together, as these Divines of our times? Which hath been done in severall Treatises, and easily may be done, as occasion serves. And for *Basil* and *Chrysostome*, if you please to peruse *Basil in exhortatione ad Baptis.* and *Chrysostomes Homil. ad Neophytos*, You may see what these say concerning Baptisme of Infants, and I believe they were able to vindicate themselves from any imputation of contradiction.

These are your proofes for the time when Baptisme of Infants in the Church was not. For *Tertullian* (whom you also bring in) we shall make another use of him from your pen, the reader finding in your title-page, that in your book there *is displayed to the view*

of

of all, from the teſtimonies of Scriptures, Fathers, Conncels, the miſchiefs, uncertainties, novelties, and abſurdities, that attend Infants Baptiſme, he could not but expect ſome direct teſtimony from one Father at the leaſt of the firſt Ages, denying the practiſe of the Baptiſme of Infants, and affirming that the Church knew no ſuch cuſtome, together with ſome account of the reaſon of the Churches refuſall. In other Controverſies between the Reformed Churches, and thoſe (who indeed keep garriſon for Antichriſt) we are able to produce ſuch home-ſpeaking evidence. In the queſtions about *Images, Altars, Dedication of Temples and Dayes to the honour of Saints*, we can produce out of Antiquity an utter rejection, and diſclaime of any uſe of them. But to inſtance in one only, though of an inferior nature, yet much paralel to this in hand, which is the uſe of *muſicall inſtruments* in publique worſhip. This was in uſe, we know, in the Church of the *Jewes*, as was the application of the initiating ſeale of the Covenant to Infants. This practiſe was at laſt brought into the Churches of Chriſtians both Greek and Latine. And this hath been alſo controverted whether lawfull, or unlawfull for Chriſtians; whether of antient uſe, or comparatively a late innovation. Now in this diſpute, ſee how expreſſe teſtimonies we can produce out of Antiquity down to the 13. Centurie, againſt it.

The Author that beares the name of *Juſtin Martyr*, howſoever (as you brand him) ſpurious, yet his teſtimony here is ſufficiently authentique, living within that compaſſe, whoſoever he was, that we take, (the later, the better.) He puts the queſtion, *Why the Church uſeth ſinging in their ſervice, after the manner of childiſh Jewes?* To which he returnes anſwer, *That ſimply to ſing, is not childiſh, but to ſing with dead inſtruments; and therefore* (he ſaith) *ſinging is received among Chriſtians; but not ſuch kind of ſinging*; Upon which words, *Bellarmine* is forced to acknowledge, *that the uſe of Organs came very late into the Church of Chriſtians.* Queſt. 107.

Chryſoſtome ſaith, *Thoſe inſtruments were then permitted the Jewes by reaſon of their weakneſſe: therefore as the Jewes were commanded to praiſe God by all inſtruments, ſo Chriſtians are commanded to praiſe with all their members, eyes, tongue, eares, and hands.* In Pſal. 150.

Iſidore

Iſidore giving the ſignification of the *Trumpet, Pſaltery, Harp, Cymball*, he ſaith, *When Almighty God was pleaſed to tolerate ſacrifices and blood, in which his people by reaſon of their weakneſſe were exerciſed, never marvell that He alſo tolerated that melodie which is by the Harp and Pſalterie.*

Thomas Aquinas, whoſe Age was as low as the 13. Centurie, ſaith, that *in the Old Teſtament there was uſe of theſe inſtruments, both becauſe that people were rough and carnall, and were to be provoked and ſtirred up as well by ſuch inſtruments as earthly promiſes, and alſo becauſe ſuch inſtruments did typifie ſomewhat elſe.* And expreſly ſaith, *That the Church of Chriſtians uſeth them not*, ne videatur Judaizare, *leſt they ſhould be thought to Judaize.*

22. 2æ quæſt. 91. art. 2.

Now if any teſtimony of this kind, in this controverſie, could be produced, that any *Father* or *Writer* of the firſt Ages did give a reaſon *why it was the cuſtome of the Jewes to circumciſe their infants, and not the cuſtome of Chriſtians to baptize them*, flatly diſavowing that uſe; Then we ſhould freely confeſſe, (however the Scriptures might be for us) yet that part of Antiquity were againſt us. In the mean ſpace we muſt ſay, that as for the *miſchiefs, uncertainties, abſurdities* of Infants baptiſme, ſo alſo for the *novelties from the teſtimonies of Scriptures, Fathers, Councels*, you have brought juſt nothing.

Your exceptions againſt our proofe from the teſtimony of Antiquity, followes:

Pag. 27. *I deſire* Mr. *M. or any other, if they can, to prove Infants baptiſme out of* Juſtin Martyr, Ireneus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, *or* Tertullian.

Anſ. For *Origen*, you confeſſe that he ſaith, *that the Church received a tradition from the Apoſtles to give Baptiſme to Infants*: and if *Origen* calls it a *tradition*, and ſuch a one that the *Church received from the Apoſtles*, then it was in uſe in *Origens* dayes, yea long before his dayes, or elſe it could be no tradition, yea from the Apoſtles dayes, in *Origens* opinion: why is there not then a plaine confeſſion of the truth, that this piece of Antiquity is againſt you?

Ibid. *I appeale to Mr. M. his own conſcience, whether this tradition of infants baptiſme be to be conjoyned in equality of power with thoſe traditions the Apoſtle mentions*, 2 Theſ. 2. 13.

Anſ. I appeale to your conſcience, what purpoſe it is to enter ſuch com-

compariſons? you know *Maſter M.* concludes, that the power is no leſſe then Divine for the Baptiſme of Infants; and that it is no unwritten tradition: Is not that evident which gives you occaſion to take this exception, *that the greateſt poynts of faith are called by the Fathers by the name of traditions, yea of Apoſtolicall traditions?* which if you do deny that ſentence out of *Cyprian*, prefixt by your ſelf in your Title page, ſhall beare witnes againſt you, *Cyprian* is ſufficient to interpret *Origen*, that his meaning is, that Baptiſme of Infants is a Doctrine that the Apoſtles taught, and the Church from their time received and kept.

Many things are falſly attributed to the Apoſtles, as the Apoſtles Creed, and that book called Canones Apoſtolorum.

I deſire you, or any other, to bring forth any one writer in the world, that did attribute the Apoſtles Creed, or that other book, to the Apoſtles, the ſpace of two hundred yeares before either the Creed was compiled, or thoſe Canons were in being: This you muſt do, or elſe in this you ſpeake to no purpoſe, *Origen calls Baptiſme of Infants a tradition received from the Apoſtles*, as you acknowledge, and yet you affirme that Baptiſme of Infants began in *Auſtins* time, or a little before, which was two hundred yeares after *Origen*, *Origen* ſure was very quicke in his forgeries. *Anſw.*

For Maſter M. *his place out of* Ireneus adverſus hereſes, lib. 2. *there is not in that place the leaſt title concerning any kind of Baptiſme, neither of Infants or any other, as I can declare upon a diligent ſearch.* *Pag* 28.

Upon a curſory ſearch, with little dilligence you may find the words which *Mr. M.* quotes & in the very place by him mentioned, which are *Chriſtus venit per ſeipſum omnes ſalvare, omnes inquam qui per eum renaſcuntur in deum, infantes, & parvulos, & pueros; whether by renaſcentia Ireneus* meanes Baptiſme, is the queſtion; *Maſter M.* quotes the *gloſſers* upon that text, affirming that *according to the phraſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, by regeneration the Apoſtle there*, means Baptiſme, which authority, if of it ſelf it be too weake, yet with your help it is undeniable, *pag.* 23. You quote a paſſage of the Councell of *Carthage*, where they ſay, *That which Infants contracted by the old generation, is purged away by regeneration*, where (you ſay) *by regeneration the Councel meanes Baptiſme.* If you know that the Councel by *regeneration* *Anſw.*

underſtood *Baptiſme*, Mr. *M.* may know, the *Gloſſers* may know that *Irenæus* by *regeneration* meanes *Baptiſme* likewiſe; and ſo we have not only Baptiſme in the words, but Baptiſme of little ones.

For *Tertullian* you have indeed retained him againſt us, but I feare not but he will ſpeake fully, and to purpoſe for us, and in the very place and words by your ſelf produc't, and here I deſire the reader to obſerve by the way, that the queſtion in this place (now appeale is made to humane teſtimony) is not *de jure*, whether Infants ought to be baptized; of this no one of the Fathers, nor yet the joynt conſent of many is a competent judge, neither party will ſuffer their faith to hang upon men; the queſtion then is *de facto*, whether it were the practiſe of the Church to baptize Infants in the ſeverall ages in which ſuch and ſuch Fathers then lived, and therefore *Maſter M.* having brought in the Teſtimony of ſeverall fathers in ſeverall Centuries, addes this Caveat, *that he relates*
Pag. 5. *them not to prove the truth of the thing, but onely the practiſe*: Now that *Tertullian* beares witnes to the practiſe of it in his time in the Latin Church, as *Origen* his Contemporary in the Greeke Church, I ſhall look no further then into the place which you produce againſt us, theſe are your words from him:

Pag. 29. 1. *Where obſerve he ſaith, for every perſons condition, diſpoſition and age, the delay of Baptiſme is more profitable, much more for infants.*

2. *He ſaith, let them become Chriſtians when they know Chriſt, this cannot Infants do.*

3. *He ſaith we will not commit earthly ſubſtance to little ones, and ſhall we commit divine?*

4. *It muſt be given to them that aske it, therefore not Infants.*

5. *He would have unmarried folkes delayed, becauſe of the ſtrength of tentation in them.*

Anſw. Here *Tertullian* complaines of the over much ſpeed, which in his opinion was made *in Baptiſme by all ſorts*, and ſaith, *delay were more profitable, eſpecially about little ones*, giving in his reaſons; is it not thence evident, that Infants were in his age baptized, though (in his thoughts) with leſſe profit? *and that ſureties in baptiſm were hazarded*, and this which he calls *leſſe marines* was uſed; doth *Tertullian* in your thoughts complaine of the practiſe of preſent abuſes

abuſes, (ſo thought by him) or doth he prophecie of ſuch, which two hundred yeares after him, (your time for the beginning of Infants Baptiſme) ſhould in the Church be put in practiſe? How came it into his thoughts to complaine of this haſte in baptizing little ones, and others, of the hazard of ſureties, if there were no ſuch thing then in practiſe? he would have unmarried folkes Baptiſme delayed as well as Infants, and I appeale to your ſelf, whether you think that unmaried perſons brought to the faith, were not in the Primitive times baptized? Whether the taking of a wife, was one of the prerequiſits unto Baptiſme, and if *Tertullian* may not be heard againſt unmaried perſons, why then ſhould he be heard againſt Infants? Put caſe you could find any one of the Fathers magnifying Infants Baptiſme, pleading with arguments for the neceſſity of it, and enlarging the benefits that come by it, yet with all complayning of the univerſall diſuſe, that though the Doctrine of Scripture were evident for it, yet the Church (even from the Apoſtles time) had been careleſſe in it, and generally omitted it, this teſtimony I beleeve you would make uſe of to make good, that Infants Baptiſme, in his age, was not in uſe: Such a teſtimony were more againſt us, then all that ever yet out of antiquity hath been brought, and ſuch a one you are pleaſed here to bring in for us, and whereas you conclude, *therefore little did he thinke it lawfull to baptize Infants*, ſuch *thoughts* cannot be concluded from his words, *unlawfull and leſſe profitable* much differ, howſoever we are tyed no more then you to ſtand to his thoughts, who (I beleeve) upon profeſſion, will not ſticke to baptize unmaried perſons, neither is it the queſtion what he thought, but what the Church in his age did practiſe.

The next Father brought in by us and excepted againſt by you is *Cyprian*.

For Cyprians *authority whereas Epiſt. 59. a certain Biſhop named* Fidus, *maintained that Infants were not to be baptized till the eighth day, there was a Councell of 66. Biſhops that met together condemning* Fidus *his opinion, yet approving Infants Baptiſme, but two things are to be conſidered. 1. The weakneſſe of the grounds; 2. The errours that came along with it, that no man hath cauſe to triumph in their authority.* Pag. 30.

I pray what ſtrength of reaſon did you find in *Tertullian* againſt the *Anſw.*

the Baptiſme of Infants, and unmaried perſons? for the errours which you heap up out of *Cyprian* we may eaſily requite you with advantage out of *Tertullian*; and whereas you conclude, *By all which we may ſee, what heed we may give to Cyprians time*, I deſire to know how you will frame an argument from his errours, to ſerve at all for your purpoſe, unleſſe it run thus, *In an age in which there are errours about Baptiſme, there can be no baptizing of Infants*; Supposing all to be Orthodox that make this their practiſe, *But in Cyprians time there were errours about Baptiſme, therefore no Baptiſme of Infants.*

Ibid.p.30. *The fore mentioned epiſtle to* Fidus, *may not without ſome grounds be ſuſpected to be ſuppoſitions.*

Anſw. Two of your grounds of ſuſpition are borrowed from circumſtance of place. *James Pamelius (that wrote anotations on this Epiſtle) knowes not where Fidus was Biſhop, and you know not the meeting place of the 66 Biſhops.* One of your reaſons is *from the weaknes of the arguments not likely to come from a Councell of 66 Biſhops*, when yet your ſelf produce as weake things concerning Baptiſme, out of thoſe Epiſtles of *Cyprian*, of which you make no queſtion; Why may not this Epiſtle have as faire a cenſure as it's fellowes?

Theſe reaſons your ſelf ſuſpect, and therefore adde.

Pag.31. *Suppoſe this Epiſtle were not faigned, among all other corruptions, Infants in* Cyprians *time did partake of the Lords Supper.*

Anſw. If it be not faigned then we have the queſtion granted, that Infants in *Cyprians* time were baptized, and if they did partake (as you ſay) of the Lords Supper, then ſure they were not excluded from Baptiſme. Your wiſdome might have concealed this reaſon: you yet ſay.

Ibid. *It appeares it was faigned, becauſe it was ſo contrary to the Doctrine of* Tertullian, *whom* Cyprian *called his maſter.*

Anſ. I think you doe not believe that *Cyprian* did *jurare in verba Magiſtri.* If *Tertullians* judgement was alwayes *Cyprians*, then *Cyprian* had been, as *Tertullian*, a Montaniſt; and ſo *Hierome* would have ſaid as well of *Cyprian* as *Tertullian*, that *he is no ſon of the Church.*

Ibid. *It appeares from* Baronius *teſtimony, that* Cyprian *was againſt it. Baron. Annal. Eccleſ. tom. pr. a. 53. p. 398.*

I pray look once more upon *Baronius*, and you will ſee that in your place alleadged he ſpeaks not concerning baptiſme of *Infants*, but of *Heretiques*. *Cyprians* opinion (which alſo, *pag.* 55. is yours) that perſons baptized by heretiques ought to be rebaptized, is famous. This opinion of his, the Orthodoxe writers of thoſe times, (as alſo of theſe) did generally oppoſe; and among the reſt *Stephanus* (as *Baronius* there tels you) *Martyr*, and *Biſhop of Rome*. The Argument of *Stephanus* (which *Baronius* there brings in) was the tradition of the Church: now to take off *Cyprian* from ſo foule ablot as the oppoſition of Church-traditions, & Church-traditions from that diſhonor of having *Cyprian* an adverſary, *Baronius* (that great ſtickler for traditions) comes in with theſe words: *Cyprian was not ſo weak to believe that Apoſtolicall traditions might be oppoſed, but he took it to be a humane corruption, and (in his thoughts) contradictory to holy Scriptures*. Afterwards we have the words that you urge, but miſ-tranſlate. *If Cyprian had been ſure that that had been an Apoſtolicall tradition, and not contrary to holy Scriptures, and ſound and ſincere doctrine, without doubt he had reſted*. And this he ſpeaks not of Baptiſme of Infants, but Baptiſme of Heretiques. You will amaze your Reader, in perſwading him that *Baronius* affirmes *Baptiſme of Infants to be not only no tradition of the Apoſtles, but alſo againſt the holy Scriptures, and ſound and ſincere doctrine*, and that he ſhould oppoſe *Cyprian* in this doctrine. If that will pleaſure you, *Baronius* tels you that *Anabaptiſme* was brought into the Church by the Heretique *Marcion*. To conclude, if this Epiſtle were ſuppoſititious, how doe you think *Auſtin* was ſo cheated by it? a better Criticke than to be abuſed by a forgery of this kind, who ſpeaking of this Epiſtle, ſaith, *Cyprian not making any new decree, but preſerving the moſt firme faith of the Church, (to reprove thoſe who thought Infants ought not to be baptized before the eighth day) determined, with ſome of his aſſociates, that a child new borne was rightly baptized*. As alſo *Hierome*, who having diſcourſt by way of Dialogue concerning the Baptiſme of Infants, hath theſe words: *And leſt you ſhould think that I underſtand this in any hereticall meaning, the bleſſed Martyr* Cyprian, *(whom you glory to follow in the interpretation of Scriptures) in his Epiſtle that he writes to* Fidus *the Biſhop concerning the Baptiſme of Infants, hath theſe things.*

Anſw.

Anno 146. *num.* 12.

Epiſt. 28. *ad Hieron.*

Hieron. lib. 3. *cont. Pelagianos edit. Pariſ. fol.* 109.

Thus having examined the whole of all your Arguments, (with which your Title-page you make ſo great a flouriſh) I leave the Reader to judge their ſtrength; And paſſing from that which you have ſaid in the negative, (*That the Baptiſme of Infants is not lawfull*) my next worke is to make good what others have ſaid in the affirmative for the lawfulneſſe of it. And here give me leave to begin where I am moſt concerned, though it be where you end your laſt pages, by you intituled, *An Anſwer to Mr.* Blake *his Arguments.*

A Vindication of the BIRTH-PRIVILEDGE, or COVENANT-*Holineſſe of Believers and their Iſſue, in the time of the Goſpel.*

PART II.

Mr. BLACKVVOOD.

Objection——

Reply.

WHy is it that you thus begin with *Objection*? when the three firſt Arguments you deale withall are no Objections againſt your Doctrine, but Poſitive Reaſons to confirme another Propoſition, and ſuch a one which in your opinion may ſtand, and your Poſition of *the unlawfulneſſe of Infants Baptiſme* ſtill hold firme. Howſoever Baptiſme in the *Birth-Priviledge* was not once named, much leſſe Baptiſme of Infants, when theſe Arguments were brought. Here the Reader may ſee no fair dealing, which will further appeare in your mangling of the words, which the Reader peruſing over, will eaſily obſerve.

Anſ. to ob. 2. p. 34.

Be-

Beleeving Gentiles ſucceed the Jewes in the Covenant; the Jewes being broken off, the Gentiles are grafted in: by vertue of this inſition, we are branches of the root *Abraham*. *Obj.*

The objector is overtaken in a groſſe abſurdity, to think there is ſome univerſall viſible Church begun in Abraham, into which upon the rejection of the Jews, the believers among the Gentiles, and their ſeed are to be received. Pag. 65.

I wonder you had not raiſed your aggravation higher, & made it the groſſeſt of abſurdities. If any ſuch conceit had ever entred into the objectors thoughts, which here you faſten upon him, it would well have borne it. Here is the Church of the Jews ſuppoſed to be rejected, and believers among the Gentiles and their ſeed to be received. And beſide theſe, an univerſall viſible Church begun in *Abraham*, into which theſe believing Gentiles and their ſeed are to be received. Where could the objector thinke that ſuch an univerſall viſible Church, neither *Jew* nor *Gentile*, had any being or ſubſiſtence? But let us look into your confutation of this fancy or ſtrange chimæra which you imagine was in your objectors braine, the abſurdity (you ſay) is groſſe: *Rep.*

For beſides the inviſible Church the body of Chriſt myſticall, there are only particular Churches under the Goſpel. Ibid.

Here I would fain learn what you mean by a *particular Church*, whether a *Family-Church*, ſuch as you ſpeak of in the houſes of *Philemon*, and *Aquila*, and *Priſcilla*; or *particular Congregations* meeting together in one roome, which there you mention likewiſe: neither of theſe can be your *particular Church*, ſo as to exclude all other from the being of Churches. For the firſt, you doubt in what ſenſe it may be called a *Church*: The ſecond you make Churches indeed in extraordinary caſes; *When the Apoſtles came to this or that City, we muſt not thinke that multitudes were converted at once*, (you ſay) *but now and then one, ſo that often the conſtituted Churches were ſo ſmall, that they could well meet together in one place, in one private houſe.* But this with you is only in the infancy of Churches: when they came to a fuller growth, one Church, it appeares by you, divided it ſelfe into ſeverall Congregations; Or whether you meane (as I may ſay) *City-Churches* with their Suburbs and Villages, ſuch as *Hieruſalem*, *Rome*, *Epheſus*, &c. combined in, and governed by their Presbyteries; any ſuch Church Par. 1. p. 7. Ibid. Ibid.

you

you diſclaime: notwithſtanding if one Church containe more then one congregation, it muſt either be *Presbyterian* or *Dioceſan*, unleſſe it be voyd of any Government at all. How can the whole body of believers joyne in vote *to admit members, heare complaints, cenſure delinquents*, and *regulate all Church-affaires*, when no one place is of capacity to receive them? If they ſhall doe it apart, (all having equall right) how ſoon will one party undoe that which another doth? Many members will thus be at loſſe of their priviledges; they muſt therefore act theſe things by thoſe who virtually are the body: We chooſe Parliament men to vote for us, becauſe all cannot meet for that buſineſſe. If it be ſo with the Church (as by your confeſſion it is) they muſt diſpatch all by their hands who are made overſeers and rulers. You ſay indeed, that a

Part 1. pag. 7. *Particular Church is no other than a company of Saints in profeſſion, explicitely or implicitely, conſenting together to worſhip God in the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer, and all other duties of Religion.* But you doe not tell us how this conſent of many Congregations can be entred, and yet Presbyterian Churches denied. But whatſoever particular Churches are, Mr. *Blake* erres in this, that he holds *an univerſall viſible Church, when there is no other then particular Churches under the Goſpel.* He had thought indeed that many *particulars* had made up a *generall*, many *particular men* had made up a *multitude of men*: but this is now a groſſe abſurdity, this you have declared your ſelfe to *explode as a monſter*, but ſo doe not thoſe that take themſelves in this way to be your equals: See the *Confeſſion of the Churches commonly called Anabaptiſts*, where we have theſe words:

Art. 33. *Chriſt hath here on earth a ſpirituall kingdome, which is the Church, which he hath purchaſed and redeemed to himſelfe, as a peculiar inheritance; which Church, as it is viſible to us, is a company, &c.* This Church thus ſet forth, is more then one particular Congregation or aſſotiation, It is that in which the

1 Cor. 12. 28. Apoſtle tels us God hath *ſet firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps in governments, diverſities of tongues.* This is not each particular Church, or any one eminent Church, but the Church univerſall, which in ſome age, and ſome place, hath enjoyed all of theſe gifts,

1 Cor. 15. 9. what doth the Apoſtle meane when he ſaith *he perſecuted the Church of God?* Doth he meane one particular Church againſt which

which his ſpleene was carried, or the whole Church? That which he calls the *Church* in one place, he calls *this way* (that is the way of Chriſtianity) in another, The Apoſtle warnes, that *we give no offence neither to the Jew nor Gentile, nor yet to the Church of God*, no one particular Church is there deciphered, but under the notion of Church, univerſally all Churches; I ſhall not enter upon the controverſie concerning an univerſall Church politicall, but this I ſhall take (were it not for you) as a truth uncontroverted, that there is a *Church* abſtracted from all conſideration of ſingle congregations, that receives the miniſterall gifts before mentioned, and ſuch a univerſall Church into the Priviledges, of which, beleevers are received.

Act. 22. 4. 1 *Cor.* 10. 32.

Much more doth he erre to think all the members of the Gentile Churches to be taken into the Iewiſh, and the Iewes caſt out. *Pag.* 65.

Reply. I that beſt know his mind can tell you, that he thinkes none of the members of the Churches of the *Gentiles*, are taken into the *Jewiſh Church*, ſo (he knowes) they muſt all become *Jewes*, and be Circumciſed after the manner of *Moſes*, look over the words by your ſelf quoted, *beleeving Gentiles ſucceed the Jewes in the Covenant*, and compare them with your own obſervation in the cloſe of your anſwer to this objection, *That not the Gentiles, but the Beleevers among the Gentiles are graffed in*, and then judge whether your objector be in a much more then groſſe errour; If he erre, you erre together with him.

He erres in thinking there is ſome Covenant, into which the Gentiles are graffed in upon the Jewes rejection of it, which ſhould belong to the Gentiles and their ſeed. *Ibid.*

Reply. You have got a ſingular dexterity in argument, when you took took upon you the perſon of an opponent, you were ſeldom ſo happy as to bring the propoſition in queſtion into the concluſion, now you have taken upon you to be a reſpondent, your firſt worke is (after a magiſteriall charge of errour) to deny the concluſion, This covenant-holines of Chriſtians, as of Jewes, was the maine ſcope of that treatiſe, which you now undertake to anſwer, and before examination of any one reaſon, you peremptorily fall (with your charge of errour) on the concluſion, I have not learnt ſuch a way of diſputation, I might with as good reaſon have begun with *he erres in denying the lawfulnes of Infants Baptiſme.*

Ibid. *For there is no other Covenant, with the Gentiles now, but that which was Covenanted before the world was, and agreed betwixt the Trinity,* Tit. 1.2. *that eternall life should be by beleeving in Christ, and this Covenant never belonged to the body of the Jewish nation, but to a remnant therein, see,* Rom.9.6,7,8. *so* ver.27.

Reply. This affirmation of yours, might be resolved into severall propositions, all of which will very well stand with your objectors Doctrine, though the Covenant be but one, yet there may be,

1. *Severall degrees and wayes of dispensation of it*, it may be given to the *Jewes*, shadowed under earthly promises, outward types, and shadowes, so that in a great bulke of Ceremonie, some light (though slender) of the blood of the Covenant, and purchased inheritance, is seen, this very Covenant was sealed in the Sacrament of the Jewes, held forth in these types, and vayled in the promises of *Canaan*, and no Covenant essentially differing from this Covenant.

2. *Severall parts or branches of it*, this one may consist of an *outward & inward part*, one as the *bark, or rine*, the other as the *sap*, one as the *shell*, the other as the *kernell*, one as *the meanes*, the other as *the end*: there must be away of conveyance of this Covenant to the Jews in their dayes, to the *Gentiles* in these Gospel times, otherwise there would be no Covenant at all, God hath no immediate intercourse with any people to strike Covenant with them, his way of Covenanting is his Ordinances, these Ordinances are therefore called the *Covenant*, as containing and conveying the Covenant, they are the outward part of the Covenant, and right and title to this outward part of it in the Church is hereditary, which your oneness of Covenant doth not overthrow; It was so among the *Jewes*, is confest, that it still is so in Gospell times, I have affirmed, and argumentatively proved, which (*tanquam ex Cathedra*) you deny, I shall first (God willing) make good those arguments which you have undertaken to answer, and then I shall make addition of some further arguments for the confirmation of it.

Rom.9.4.

Ibid. *This insition in the roote* Abraham, *in the Jewes stead by a visible constitution is meerly imaginary.*

Reply. If this insition be meerly imaginary, then the Apostles whole dispute upon this subject is imaginary also: for he speakes of the body of the Jewes, and the body of the Gentiles called by the Ordi-

Ordinances, and not any of perſonall priviledge, or qualification, and the inſition of the viſible multitude of converted Gentiles (all called, ſome choſen) can be no other but by a viſible conſtitution, you give your reaſon.

For Abraham *ſtands as a roote two wayes:* 1. *Viſibly to the Jewes that deſcend of him.* *Ibid.*

I confeſſe that he is a roote to ſuch, and ſo is every ſon of *Abraham*, every ſon of *Adam* (that hath poſterity) is a roote likewiſe. But *Abraham*, *Iſaack*, *Jacob*, *Jeſſe*, *David*, and all within the promiſe (by vertue of the Covenant made with them) are a holy root, and convey that Covenant-holineſſe to all that are their branches, *Abraham* is a firſt leading roote of all thoſe that deſcend from him, or that are inoculated into him, by admiſſion of the ſame Covenant with him. *Reply.*

The *proſelytes in Iſrael* were thus made branches of this roote, and ſo themſelves were a *radix ſubalterna*, a ſubordinate holy root of their poſterity, not only *Vriah the Hittite*, *and Ruth the Moabite*, but alſo *Doeg the Edomite*, in caſe he had iſſue, yea all theſe proſelytes of the Scribes and Phariſees making, were branches as well as *Saul*, *Shemei*, *Corah*, *Dathan and Abiram.*

The godly proſelytes were equall with the beſt of naturall Jewes, all proſelytes are equall in priviledge with the Jewes, of meere carnall deſcent, without any further qualification, To reſtraine theſe hereditary priviledges, onely to the ſeed of *Abrahams* fleſh, is to caſt out of Covenant, not onely the ſeed of beleeving Gentiles, but alſo of beleeving proſelytes, both of them directly againſt the Scriptures. *Iſa.* 56.6.7. *Exod.* 12.49. *Num.* 15.15.

2. *Inviſible, to the beleevers among the Jewes and Gentiles, ſee* Rom. 4.11.17. *Its by vertue of this latter inſition, that not the Gentiles but the beleevers among the Gentiles are graffed in.* *Ibid.*

That diſtinction *of Gentiles, and beleeving Gentiles* might here have been ſpared, for no man beleeves, that Gentiles in unbeleife, are any branches, or that they do receive hereby any priviledge: but it is an inſition (by a faith ſaving, and juſtifying) into *Abraham*, as an inviſible roote that you meane and no other, ſeeing *Abraham* who is inviſible they are thus ingraffed, ſo *Abraham dwells in them by faith, and they in* Abraham, *they receive ſap for a ſpirituall life from* Abraham, *as a branch from the root*, & they may ſay, *Reply.*

ſay, *the life that we live in the fleſh, We live by faith in the ſon of* Terah; All this wil follow, if a livtly juſtifying faith only doth inviſibly ingraft us into *Abraham*, but may we not otherwiſe diſtinguiſh of *Abraham*? 1. As a man. 2. As a profeſſor of faith, or worſhipper of God. 3. As a juſtified, or regenerate perſon.

1. *As a man*, he is indeed a root to all deſcending from him, but no holy root, they come from him, naturall men, not men of ſuch a faith or worſhip, and ſo he was the root of the *Hagerens*, the *Edomites*, and of all of the lyne of *Ketura*, as well as of Iſrael.

2. *As a juſtified regenerate man*, ſo he himſelf is a branch of Chriſt, who in another reſpect was a branch of him, his juſtification was a perſonall priviledge, not communicable, *the juſt ſhal live by his faith*, they onely and not their ſeed, an Old Teſtament truth, regeneration is, and ever was an habit infuſed, not deſcendable, or to be communicated.

Heb. 2.4. 3. *As a profeſſor of faith or worſhipper of God*, ſo he is a *root or firſt fruit, viz.* a begining of that royall noble priviledge to all his ſeed, and thoſe afar off, whom God ſhall call to the ſame profeſſion of faith and worſhip: In this relation the Covenant made with *Abraham, Iſaac, ad Iacob*, entitled all their naturall ſeed, and all that profeſſe the like faith in that royall priviledge of Gods own peculiar people, all profeſſors of the ſame truth (which Scripture ſtiles by the name of beleevers to the end of the world) are within the verge of this covenant, as receving a priviledge communicable and deſcendable, and this is a reply ſufficient to your anſwer in this place, but this argument you alſo make your twelfth

Pag. 44. objection, where we have *Mr. M.* in the margent, the three firſt branches of your anſwer there I paſſe by, the firſt being not to the preſent purpoſe, the ſecond we willingly yeild, and the third is already fully ſpoken too.

Pag. 45. *The Apoſtle ſpeakes of the Jewiſh off-ſpring, & not of the Gentiles; And although the Jewes are brought into one body, and the middle wall of partition is broken down*, Ephe. 2. 14. *It is to be underſtood of beleeving Jewes and Gentiles, united in Chriſt, by myſticall union not by viſible Eccleſiaſticall diſpenſation.*

Reply. Herein let the reader of meaneſt capacity judge, doth not the Apoſtle diſtinguiſh the off-ſpring or branches into two kinds? one naturall, which were *Abrahams* ſeed (the greateſt and moſt noble

noble part of Iſrael being deſcended from his loynes) the other adventitious made branches by inſition, the root is common to both, either of both make up the lump.

Whether by firſt fruit and root are meant, Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Iacob—*or whether by firſt fruit and root are meant Jeſus Chriſt?* *Queſt.*

By firſt fruits are meant Chriſt, &c— *Anſw.*

Anſwering your objector, *Abraham* (you ſay) is a root two wayes, anſwering Maſter *M.* (producing the ſame text) you ſay he is no root, never in Scripture called a root, or firſt fruits, whether of theſe ſhall we take to be your mind, that which you will abide by? This in this place it ſeemes moſt probable, becauſe it is ſo formall an anſwer to a queſtion, and backt with reaſons, Yet the other comes after it, and ſecond thoughts we uſe to judge the beſt. *Reply.*

For your reaſons of this paradox as contrary to the truth, as to your ſelfe, that Chriſt is the root, and not *Abraham.*

1. *Becauſe* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob *in Scripture are never called by theſe names of root, or firſt fruit, and their poſterity by the name of lump, but Chriſt and his body the elect are called by this name,* 1 Cor. 15. 20. Iſay. 53. 2. Apoc. 5. 5. and 22. 16. *Pag.* 45.

1. Though *Abraham, Iſaac,* and *Jacob* be not in any other Scripture called by the name of root, yet *Jeſſe* is, and his poſterity branches, and may not they by proportion be a root, as well as he? *Reply.* *Eſay.* 11. 1.

2. This is but a ſimilitude, or metaphor, and how many ſimilitudes may we find in Scripture once uſed, and no oftner? Who is meant by root and firſt fruits, *Rom.* 11. 6.

3. Chriſt is called the root, and firſt fruits we confeſſe; but in a far different ſenſe from that which is here inſiſted upon, and in no one text is he both root, and firſt fruits as *Abraham* is here. In the words there is a double ſimilitude, one from *Nature,* the other from the *Leviticall Law.* The root muſt be extended no further then the other ſimilitude of firſt fruits will beare, which is not to give life (as a naturall root doth to the branches, and Chriſt to his members) but only as a firſt beginning from whence an holineſſe of dedication and conſecration followes, which is not Chriſt, but thoſe of whom Chriſt after the fleſh came, They are called naturall branches, not by any qualification of nature to make them holy, which is contrary to the Apoſtle *Epheſ.* 2. 3. But by reaſon of their intereſt by right of birth in the free Covenant of God.

Naturales vocat, non quibus a natura ineſſet ulla ſanctitas, ſed qui ex ijs nati erant, quos dominus gratuito fœdere reliquis gentibus ſegregarat, Beza.

Ibid. 2. *The root and branches, the firſt fruit, and lump, muſt be of the ſame kind, but* Abraham *and his poſterity are not of the ſame kind, his poſterity being many of them wicked: But Chriſt and his body myſticall are of the ſame kind, having the graces of Chriſt communicated to them.*

Reply. And ſo it is here, all are of the ſame faith and profeſsion, all are handfaſted (as I may ſay) to one and the ſame God in Religion, this holineſſe that the text holds forth, is the ſame in *Abraham* and his poſterity.

Ibid. 3. *The lump and branches meant here, are ſuch as are holy perſons; but what holineſſe can be in the fleſhly ſeed of* Abraham, *being now in a ſtate of rejection that they can truly, and properly be ſo called?*

Reply. There is no holineſſe in them, in the ſtate of rejection, and therefore they are no branches; but as the Apoſtle ſaith they are *cut off by unbeliefe.* The body of that people not accepting the Meſsiah, but profeſsedly oppoſing him, are cut off from the Covenant of *Abraham*, and are become an unholy root of an unholy poſterity, Yet in regard of their former being alone in Covenant with God, and Gods determination to receive them againe, they may be reputed (comparatively to others out of Covenant) ſome way ſacred, they are *enemies*, and yet *beloved* with the love of benevolence, or determination of their future call, and ſo in actuall exiſtence they are caſt off, and unholy, yet in regard of Gods choyce they are as ſacred. See *Rom.* 11.28. for the contrary that *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Jacob* are the root, take theſe conſiderations.

Res ipſa oſtendit Abrahamum Iſaacum & Iacobum, cum primitijs, ipſorum autem poſteros, cum maſſa comparari. Beza *in locum.*

1. The root is that, of which the whole body of the Jewes by profeſsion, once were branches, but now cut off, the Apoſtle there diſputes of their cutting off, who once were branches, But the whole body of this Nation were never branches of Chriſt, many of them were of their father the Devill. *Ioh.* 8.44.

2. *Root and branch* in the text, are ſuch that may be ſevered, and the branch againe inoculated, but Chriſt and his branches cannot be ſevered: therefore root and branch is not here Chriſt and his members.

3. That is the root and firſt fruits which renders them *beloved* when in reſpect of the Goſpell they were enemies, and in unbeliefe, *beloved* I mean with a love of benevolence, or as I may ſay, inten-

intention of good to that people, But *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, and *Iacob* render them in this condition thus beloved, *As concerning the Goſpel they are enemies for your ſakes, but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers ſake*, Rom. 11. 28.

The grand birth previledge of the Iewes was to be an holy Nation, but this honour to be an holy nation is given to believing Chriſtians, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. therefore Chriſtians in this birth priviledge, are equall to the Nation of the Jewes. *Pag.* 65. *Object.* 2.

The very anſwer Maſter Blake *goeth about to refute, but cannot is enough*, Peter *meanes it of the inviſible Church, the body of Chriſt*, &c— *Anſw.*

You might have done well, not only to have acquainted your Reader what Maſter *Blakes* refutation is, but alſo to have taken ſome paines to diſcover the weakneſſe of it, that men might ſee more then the bare word of an adverſary, that he cannot refute it: *Reply.*

The anſwer it ſelfe you doe ſo mangle in leaving out ſome part, and changing others, that it is rendred to the Reader in a notable peece of non-ſence, I deſire thoſe that will doe me right, and ſee your dealings, to compare the birth priviledge, and your book together.

This priviledge to be an holy Nation, which belongs to the myſticall body of Chriſt, he would draw to all Gentile Nations, which profeſſe Chriſt, among which there are thouſands are viſible unbelievers; becauſe it was a birth priviledge of the Iewes to be an holy Nation, which is a meer Paralogiſme. Pa. 65. & 66.

And he gives his reaſon (that it belongs not only to Chriſts myſticall body) out of the context, from the words that goe before, and from thoſe that follow after, and from other Scriptures explaning it, by which his argument appears a right framed ſyllogiſme. Theſe reaſons you would ſure in a word or two have examined, if you had been able to have refuted, or had not beleeved that your bare word will take with ſome Readers beyond any argument of others, their implicit faith in you being equall to that conceit, which many have of themſelves, that you are wiſer then ſeven that can render a reaſon; and whereas you ſay *that among theſe Gentile Nations that profeſſe Chriſt, there are thouſands that are viſible unbeleevers*, How you can ſalve it I know not, I am ſure it will paſſe with the moſt Readers for a moſt notable contradiction; If the profeſsion *Reply.*

of

of faith is alone that which makes a viſible believer, then to ſay that thouſands that profeſſe Chriſt, are viſible unbelievers, is as groſſe a contradiction, as to ſay, thouſands of men are no reaſonable creatures. But the profeſſion of Chriſt makes a viſible believer: upon profeſſion, in Scripture, they have ever the name of believers, as we ſee in *Simon Magus*, the *rocky ground*, and thoſe multitudes in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; upon aſſent to the truth of Doctrine, this title is never denied: you find *unbeliever* the title of men in heatheniſme, and oppoſition to Chriſtian profeſſion.

Pag. 66. Object. 3. The ſeed of believers muſt either be lookt upon as fœderally holy as Jewes by nature were, or elſe as ſinners of the Gentiles: A third ſort cannot be aſſigned. If under the firſt, we have that we contend for: If under the ſecond, then the heavy doome of ſinners, Gentiles, aliens, is their condition; they are then without Chriſt, without hope, &c.

Solut. *We look upon them as ſinners of the Gentiles, tainted with originall ſinne; and either theſe perſons live and grow up to yeares, and are capable of believing, and ſo ſalvable; for elſe they die in infancy, and are ſalvable through the preſentment of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to Gods juſtice for originall ſinne, and therefore not without hope, nor without Chriſt.*

Reply. If you pleaſe to examine the *Birth-Priviledge*, you ſhall ſee that this diſtinction looks not at all at *qualifications of nature*, (which without diſtinction is the ſame in all, both Jew and Gentile) but to *Covenant-relation*, and if in this reſpect you place them among heathen, *without Chriſt, and without hope*, and yet ſuppoſe them to be ſaved by *the preſentment of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt*, you tell us of wonders, if any in a ſtate of heatheniſme without Chriſt, may be ſaved by Chriſt; then a man may take up without danger that ſo much abhorred ſpeech, *anima mea ſit cum Philoſophis*, let my dying ſoul be among the Heathen. For your diſtinction of Infants, ſome *dying in infancie*, and others *growing up to years*; If you can tell us of any Scriptures applying Chriſts merits to all dying ones, to take away originall ſinne, and denying it to others, (which, comparing your words, *p.* 12. appeares to be your meaning; here you are to ſpeak of the ſtate of Infants in generall, and there you ſay, *in generall ſo dying, they are ſaved*:) We ſhal then hearken to that new revelation, in the mean ſpace you are deſired to ſpeak out without tergiverſations

verſations or ſhuffles, where you place Infants *in regard of Covenant relation*, whether with Jewes by birth, (as the Text ſpeaks) or elſe with ſinners of the Gentiles.

This Argument is alſo your fifteenth Objection, for which you quote Mr. *M.* and is here to be examined, in which your firſt Anſwer ſpeaking of election and reprobation, is not to our purpoſe: the ſecond your *Errata's* intreat to blot out, the Objection it ſelfe we have in theſe words. *Pag.* 47.

There are but two kingdomes, families, cities, houſholds, *ver.* 2. Gods, and the Devils. If Infants be not of Gods family, kingdom, houſhold, then are they of the devils, which is uncharitable to think. *Object.*

If by kingdome, city, family, houſhold, they mean the viſible Church; then if becauſe Infants are not of this, they are of the Devils kingdome, we deny the conſequence, for many are of this kingdome, who notwithſtanding are of the Devils kingdome: as Iſhmael, Magus: *many are not of this kingdome, who notwithſtanding are of Gods kingdome, as* Job, Jacob, *before he was borne,* *Anſw.*

Nothing but the viſible Church can be meant, and yet the conſequence is of force, notwithſtanding your inſtances in ſome wicked ones within the Church, and ſome good ones out of it: Who ever doubted but that there are ſome weeds in the garden, which yet is the place of flowers? and ſome flowers in the commons, which yet is the place of weeds? The Church is ſtill Gods viſible kingdome, and they that are without it (though they have right of entrance) are yet viſibly out of this kingdome, and having ſuch right of entrance, they ſuffer wrong when they are not received. If you were not ſuffered to live or make abode in this Kingdome (being a free-borne ſubject) you would account it a violation of right, though you were told, the King had many ſubjects out of his dominions. If you were kept out of all viſible ſociety in the Church, being a profeſſed Chriſtian, and viſible Saint, you would eſteem it an injury, notwithſtanding you had learnt that ſalvation in ſuch caſes might be had. And this is your dealing with the Infants of believers. For your inſtance in *Job*, he lived I ſuppoſe in a viſible Church, as his ſacrifice with acceptance doth evidence. As for *Jacob*, when we are ſpeaking of a Church viſible, you give a ſtrange inſtance in one (out of compaſſe of it) who had no viſible being. The queſtion is not concerning the everlaſting eſtate of Infants, but their preſent viſible condition, which muſt be either *Reply.*

within, or elſe out of Gods viſible kingdome. Theſe Arguments which you have hitherto toucht upon, were brought with ſeverall others, to eſtabliſh the *Birth-priviledge and Covenant-holineſſe of believers and their iſſue in the dayes of the Goſpel.* If the Reader pleaſe to view the queſtion there ſtated, the grounds laid down of ſuch a Covenant in generall, with the Arguments brought to make it good, as in the Old, ſo in the New Teſtament, both negative and poſitive, he will better judge of the validity of this anſwer, and your way of dealing in anſwering, I ſhall here further take liberty to make ſome addition to thoſe Arguments for ſuch an hereditary birthright as is there avouched: And thus I reaſon;

Additionall arguments to confirme the birth priviledge and Covenant holineſſe of beleevers, and their iſſues.

1. If *Abraham* be a father in reſpect of Covenant, both of the circumciſed, and thoſe of the uncircumciſion, then it followes, that this outward Covenant-holineſſe is hereditary, and a priviledge of birth, conveyed from anceſtors to poſterity. But *Abraham* is thus a father in reſpect of Covenant to the circumciſed, and thoſe of the uncircumciſion. *Ergo, &c.*

The *Minor* is plaine, *Rom.*4. 11, 12.

The Conſequence is alſo plaine: it is neceſſary to the *being* of a father (truly ſo called) to communicate *being* to poſterity. *Hath the raine a father* (ſaith *Job*) *or who begot the drops of the dew?* If then *Abraham* be a father not only in reſpect of *being in nature*, but alſo of *being in covenant*, then as a father he doth communicate a *covenant-being*, not inward, which is incommunicable, but outward, which only is hereditary, and deſcendable.

Job 38. 28.

2. If there be an outward covenant, & holines of covenant-relation (different from that which is inherent & qualitative) in the dayes of the Goſpel, as there was in the time of the Law; then it follows, that there is the ſame reaſon of an hereditary deſcent of Covenant now, as then, in the dayes of the Goſpel, as in the times of Law. The force of this Conſequence (as it is evident of it ſelf, ſo) the greateſt adverſaries of this Birth-priviledge doe acknowledge, an outward (if any ſuch be) is ever hereditary and deſcendable, and therefore with all their ſtrength ſtrive to oppoſe. No man, with them, in any ſenſe is a believer, but a man in Chriſt; no man a Saint by calling, but he that is truly ſanctified and led by the ſpirit; every Scripture-calling by the Ordinances, is an effectuall calling: Some in a great ſolemnity have publikely profeſſed, that if any Covenant-holineſſe not inherent and ſanctifying, or (as they uſe to ſpeak) reall, can be found

found in the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, they are ready to quit the cauſe, and betake themſelves to our party.

The Aſſumption therefore, that there is ſuch an outward Covenant, and holineſſe of Covenant-relation in the dayes of the Goſpel, to be found in the Scriptures of the New Teſtament, I ſhall endeavour to prove.

1. Such as the calling is in the dayes of the Goſpel, ſuch is the holineſſe and Covenant-relation: as is the one, ſo is the other; if the one be outward, the other is alſo outward; if the one be inward, the other is alſo inward: It is by Calling that we are at all in Covenant, that we have any holineſſe either outward or inward; *We are called* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *with an holy calling.* ——But in the dayes of the Goſpel, and Scriptures of the New Teſtament, there is an outward calling as well as an inward, a calling to an outward Covenant-holineſſe of relation, as well as to inherent holineſſe and ſanctification, *Mat.*20.16. *Mat.*22.14. *Many are called, but few choſen.* 2 *Tim.*1.9.

The elect of God are holy with an inherent holineſſe of reall graces, *Coloſ.*3.12. Theſe in the Text are called, and not elect; they are therefore called to a holineſſe not inherent and reall.

Effectual calling according to Gods purpoſe, as it is to holines inherent & ſanctifying, *Eph.*1.4. ſo it is a conſequent of election, and an aſſuring evidence of our predeſtination to glory, *Rom.*8.30. But this calling is no conſequent of election, it is no ſuch aſſuring evidence of our predeſtination to glory, ſuch are caſt out after calling: this is therefore an outward calling, not effectuall and according to Gods purpoſe, unto an outward, not an inherent holineſſe. In every calling there is a *terminus a quo*, ſome condition and ſtation that men leave; and a *terminus ad quem*, ſome condition and ſtation into which they are received. Now theſe of ſtrangers from God being called to God, and yet in no inward covenant of grace, and inherent ſanctification, it muſt therefore follow, that they are called unto an outward Covenant, with an holy calling of outward Covenant-relation only: And that this Scripture hath relation to New Teſtament times, is plaine from our Saviours words, ſetting out in that Scripture the ſtate of the Kingdome of Heaven.

2. If there be a call of the Word, and miniſteriall outward ordinances, without any working of the Spirit to ſanctification, then

it must needs follow that there is such *a call*, such a *Covenant*, such a *holinesse*, that is not inherent, and sanctifying, a call, and Covenant only outward, a holinesse only of relation, The word without the spirit can reach no higher. But there is a call of the word, without any changing work of the spirit, bringing men into a forme, without power, as appeares in the parable of the good and bad ground, and might be made good, by divers instances.

3. If the titles of *beleever* and *saint*, wrought by such a calling in the New Testament, be of equall latitude, and extent with those of the Old Testament, *people of God*, *holy*, *beloved*, &c. then it followes that there is an outward Covenant, and holinesse of relation now as then, The consequence is plaine; but these titles, *beleevers*, *saints*, (which Scripture makes one, and the same, *Eph.* 1.1.) are taken in the same latitude now, as the other titles above mentioned were then; they were then taken, not only for a people truely holy, and indeed beloved, but for a people related to a holy God, holy by seperation from other Nations, and dedication to the Lord, It was no contradiction in the Old Testament to be called (a) *children of God* (b) *holy people*, *Gods peculiar people* (c) *his portion*, *his heritage*, *&c.* and yet to be branded, *as* (d) *stifnecked*, (e) *of an iron sinew*, (f) *adulterous*, (g) *a sinfull nation*, (h) *foolish*, *unwise*, *as* (i) Sodom *and* Gomorrah. It is no contradiction to stile men in the New Testament (k) *beleevers*, *saints by calling*, when they yet, not only (m) *nourish factions*, *and divisions*, but when (n) they *doe wrong*, *defraud*, when they contend, and dispute *for*, *Idoll pollutions*, *and defilements*; when they (p) *profane the Lords Table*, *are* (q) *fornicators*, *uncleane*, *lascivious* (r) *lukewarme* (s) *dead*, when they have a *name to live*, In Scripture language these are *beleevers*, *saints*, and of the Churches of God: as the other were stiled holy, beloved, *&c.* So these are now stiled beleevers, saints, *&c.*

(a) *Deu.* 14.1.
(b) *Deu.* 14.2.
(c) *Deu.* 32.9.
(d) *Deut.* 9.6 13.
(e) *Isay* 48.4.
(f) *Ezek.* 16. 32.
(g) *Isai.* 1.4.
(h) *Deu.* 32.6.
(i) *Isai.* 1.10.
(k) 1 *Cor.* 3.5. 1 *Cor.* 1.2.
(m) 1 *Cor.* 3.3
(n) 1 *Cor.* 6.7.
(o) 1 *Cor.* 8. 10.
(p) 1 *Cor.* 11. 20.
(q) 2 *Cor.* 12. 20.
(r) *Rev.* 3.16.
(s) *Rev.* 3.1.

4. If there were this outward Covenant, and holinesse of relation before the call of *Abraham*, or the making of a people (as you use to phrase it) typically holy, then there is the same reason that now when this ceases (and no more such peculiar typicall holinesse is found) there still should be such an outward Covenant and holinesse of relation remaining. This is evident.

But before *Abraham*, or any supposed typicall nationall holy-

nesse

neſſe, there was ſuch an outward Covenant, and holineſſe of relation, *Gen.6.2. The ſonnes of God* (children of the Church as Interpreters conclude ſuch as *Iſrael* was, *Deut.14.1.* it is plaine that the holineſſe of regeneration was wanting in them) *took the daughters of men*, the daughters of the children of *Cain*, that were without any ſuch relation to God, driven with him from Gods preſence, from the place where God had any ſetled worſhip. Here was a Covenant, if *Sonne* and *Father* carry any relation; yet no inward Covenant, the inward work of grace cannot be imagined in theſe perſons, and thus I ſuppoſe the Aſſumption is fully proved.

That holineſſe which the root neceſſarily tranſmits to the branch, the anceſtor to poſterity, muſt neceſſarily be a birth priviledge, and holineſſe of deſcent, hereditary; and not inherent, this is evident, ſeeing holineſſe inherent, and of regeneration is not at all tranſmitted, much leſſe neceſſarily tranſmitted.

But there is ſuch an holineſſe in the dayes of the Goſpel, which the root neceſſarily tranſmits to the branch, the anceſtor to poſterity, *Ergo*, &c.

This argument I freely profeſſe to bring not for Maſter *Blackwoods* ſake, who denies the principles on which it is grounded; but for their ſakes with whom it is more convincing.

The aſſumption I make good by two Scriptures. 1 *Cor.*7. 14. *The unbeleeving husband is ſanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is ſanctified by the husband; elſe were their children uncleane; but now are they holy*, In this text I ſhall obſerve.

1. Some things which thoſe with whom I now deale with, readily grant, and in which wee are agreed.

1. That holineſſe in this place, is not legitimation of iſſue, not any civill holineſſe of chaſtity; but holineſſe of Covenant with God, which entitles to Church priviledges, and ordinances.

2. That this ſanctifying of the unbeleeving party, in, or by the beleever, is only inſtrumentall: they joyntly become a root to produce an holy branch, this unbeliefe is no impediment of the holyneſſe of iſſue.

3. That the ſame holineſſe, which is in the parent, is tranſmitted to the Infant the ſame in kind, and no other.

2. Some things I ſhall note that cannot be denyed.

1. That by unbeleever, is meant one in Gentiliſme, not called

out of Paganiſh Idolatry, and not an unregenerate perſon, profeſſing Chriſtianity: there was no ſcruple in their head, whether they might abide with their yoke-fellow profeſsing Chriſt, and not truly ſanctified.

2. By the beleever is meant ſuch a one as is no infidell, not in Paganiſh Idolatry, but called to a profeſſion of Chriſt; this followes from the former.

3. That the holineſse here mentioned is tranſmittible, deſcendable; ſuch that may be conveyed from parent to child, from anceſtor to poſterity.

4. That the Apoſtles affirmation that *the children are holy*, as his negation, *that they are not uncleane*, containes a certain truth, an univerſall propoſition, or equall with an univerſall, a priviledge never fayling ſuch a couple, one party being a profeſsed Chriſtian, the other joyn'd in marriage, and ſanctified in reſpect of iſsue, ever bring forth children, that have their denomination, and enjoy priviledges with the beleeving party, are named, and reputed among thoſe that are holy.

Some (that hold that by the beleever, is here meant the regenerate, and by the unbeleever unregenerate perſons, that the holines here is inherent) will have the words to hold true *ad plurimum*: For the moſt part it will ſo fall out, *Theſe beleeving regenerate ones ſhall have a holy ſeed rather then others, and becauſe none can deny but ſuch, or ſuch an Infant is thus holy: therefore they are to be baptized, and taken into the Congregationall aſſembly of Saints*, But I wiſh theſe to conſider, how full and flat this Comment runs againſt the text.

1. No ſcruple ever was among the *Corinthians*, whether a regenerate man, might live with an unregenerate wife, profeſſing Chriſt, There was never ſuch a doubt heard of. But the ſcruple was, whether a profeſt Chriſtian, might live with a profeſt infidell, and theſe were the *beleever*, and *unbeleever* in the text about whom the queſtion did ariſe.

2. This holineſse of regeneration is not at all tranſmittible, none can convey any habit infuſed, or acquired into his child, as he doth a priviledge, or hereditary immunity, ſuch holineſſe is no reſult of the faith of the parent.

3. The *Corinthians* had received ſlender ſatisfaction concerning

their children, when it was onely upon, *it may be, rather they then others ſhall be holy*, eſpecially obſerving the contrary event by dayly experience, the Apoſtles words ſound in another manner, *now are they holy:* The Prieſts could anſwer the caſe of conſcience more peremptorily, *No, it ſhall not be holy, it ſhall be unclean*, and ſhall we think that the Apoſtle anſwered thus ambiguouſly? Hag. 2. 12. 13.

4. If both parties had been in unbeleefe, then the ſeed had been undoubtedly uncleane; If this *elſe* had not been, they could not have been holy, the Apoſtle doth not ſay, there is more danger of their iſſue that are both in unbeliefe, but (in their birth condition) they are uncleane, and the like certainty there is of one member of the Apoſtles diſtinction, the like certainty there is of the other, otherwiſe upon theſe grounds, even the iſſue of unbeleerves may be baptized, ſeeing there is no certainty but they alſo may be holy: The holineſſe then is a deſcendable holineſſe, not inward but outward, ſuch that neceſſarily and infallibly deſcends, as do hereditary priviledges.

The ſecond Scripture whereby I make good the Aſſumption, that there is ſuch a holineſſe in the dayes of the Goſpel (which the parent tranſmits to the child, the anceſtor to poſterity) is *Rom.* 11. 16. *For if the firſt fruits be holy, the lump is alſo holy, and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches:* Thoſe with whom I have here to deale in this place alſo grant, that the *root* is the *anceſtor*, the *branch* the *off-ſpring or poſterity*, the *firſt fruit* is the *beginning of the race or line*, the *lump* is the *body of the kindred, or poſterity that followes*, and if the propoſition in the former Scripture ſhould be indefinite, and leave a doubt in the iſſue (as hopefully holy, and not certainly,) yet this is univerſall and neceſſary, *if the root then the branch is holy*, if the child of a holy father, & becauſe the child of a holy father, he is holy alſo, *qua tale* is *omne*; this propoſition is *quatenus ipſum*, no propoſition in Logicke can be framed more univerſal and neceſſary: The argument then is of ſtrength, that there is a holines tranſmitted & conveyed, neceſſarily tranſmitted & conveyed from the parent in covenant to his iſſue, which ſerves to eſtabliſh the birth priviledge, & covenant holines of beleevers, & their iſſue, in the dayes of the Goſpel, & let me once more warne to avoyd miſtakes that this laſt argument is not againſt Mr. *Black.* nor his party, but againſt thoſe, who (with us) hold the lawfulnes of the Baptiſme of

of the Infants of regenerate perſons, but (with Mr. *Blackwood* and his party) deny any outward covenant-holineſſe to deſcend from parents in covenant, to their iſſue. Now having finiſhed theſe additionall arguments for aſſertion of the *Birth-Priviledge*, I returne again to Mr. *Blackwood*, who at laſt hath hit upon an Argument for the lawfulneſſe of Infants Baptiſme, and indeed only upon one in that Treatiſe.

Pag 66. Object. 4. Thoſe that have the ſubſtance and thing ſignified, they muſt not be denied the ſigne: But Infants have the thing ſignified, *viz.* Chriſt, *Ergo*, they muſt not be denied the ſigne.

Reſp. *We deny the minor, that all Infants (nay the greater part) have not the thing ſignified, but grow up and prove wicked; and for thoſe that have the thing ſignified, let them make it appeare to any Church of Chriſt, and they cannot deny them Baptiſme. Mean time, becauſe the greater part goe the broad way, and the Church is to judge onely of viſible things, give us leave to forbeare till we ſee how thoſe that have right can make it appeare.*

Reply. The reaſon that you give of the deniall of the minor propoſition, and ſo conſequently of the right of Infants to Baptiſme, will prove if you pleaſe to examine, of equall force againſt all thoſe, of ripeſt years, and greateſt growth, whom you do baptize in your moſt ſelect congregations; If there be none of thoſe whom you receive to Baptiſme, that afterwards do prove wicked, you either have a better faculty of diſcerning than ever the Apoſtles of Chriſt had, or elſe are more happy in the men that offer themſelves: How doth it appeare to you (that have conſtituted, as you call it, a Church of Chriſt) that they who tender themſelves to Baptiſme, have right to Chriſt? is not their right to the outward part of the covenant, by vertue of their profeſſion, that which undoubtedly doth entitle them? and have they any other right that you can determine otherwiſe than on the ground of charity? *Becauſe the greater part goe the broad way* (as you ſay) *and the Church is to judge only of viſible things, give us leave to forbeare till we ſee how they can make their right to appeare*: If I ſhall give you this leave, (according to your complement) and you ſhall take it, then you may know from Jeſus Chriſt, that there muſt be no Baptiſme, no not of any called perſons, ſeeing of many that are called, moſt go the broad way, and few are choſen: you muſt have a further right

aſſured,

aſſured, then you can have by their calling, a viſible right in regard of the covenant of God, is that which doth certainly entitle grown perſons, and this Chriſtians have to plead for their Infants.

This argument here brought is your 22th. Objection, with Mr. *M.* in the margent, here you deny the minor, there both major and minor: The major you deny for three reaſons.

1. *The inward grace or ſubſtance belonged to the godly Jewiſh Women, and not the outward ſigne for want of a command.* Pag. 51.

Even now you ſaid, *For thoſe Infants that have the thing ſignified, let them make it appeare to any Church, and they cannot deny them Baptiſme.* But here, though they have the thing ſignified, they muſt be denied for want of a command. Rep.

2. *The inward grace belongs only to the elect, but no Church can tell who is elect.*

Then no Church may admit any to Baptiſme, being as ignorant of the election of men of yeares, as of Infants. Rep.

3. *Perſons may have an inviſible right to Ordinances, but not a viſible right.*

The Churches are to diſpence according to right, and not otherwiſe: an inviſible right we doe not inquire after: all right to Ordinances is viſible; You know that we maintaine a viſible right in Infants equall to that in grown perſons, that Infants have a viſible right to Baptiſme. Rep.

In the reaſons that you give for the deniall of the aſſumption, that Infants are partakers of the inward grace in Baptiſme, as well as grown men; 1. You diſtinguiſh between Infants of thoſe that live in Proteſtant Churches, and Infants of believers: *Proteſtants*, and *believers*, with you are contradiſtinct termes, Proteſtants are not believers; but your meaning (I ſuppoſe) is, that all Proteſtants are not believers, but thoſe in whom is the power of godlineſſe. But this is not according to the language of Scriptures; All Proteſtants are profeſſours, and all profeſſours, in Scripture dialect, are beleevers, All that receive the Word from the ſeeds-mens hand, are believers, and not only thoſe that receive it into *good and honeſt hearts.* You after deny *all Infants of Proteſtants, and all Infants of believers to be partakers of the inward grace of Baptiſme, ſeeing many of them prove wicked: & if we limit it* (you ſay in the 3. place) *to ſome Infants, then none can put a difference betwixt thoſe ſome, and others.* Luk. 8. 13.

Reply. We doe not maintain an undoubted participation of the inward grace in all Infants, nor in any one particular Infant, no more than you are able to maintain in profeſſours; But a capacity of the inward grace, we ſay, is the ſame in Infants and grown perſons. In this gradation of yours, in which you ſpeak of Infants, we can goe along with you, and apply it unto grown perſons.

Though ſome are partakers of the inward grace, it is in reſpect of election, and not of actuall converſion.

Reply. Election of Infants is here by you granted, but all converſion denied: how then are all dying Infants, or any Infants dying ſaved, ſeeing that of the Apoſtle is univerſall? *Fleſh and blood cannot in-*
1 Cor. 15. 50. *herit the kingdome of God.* And I pray reconcile this with your own words, *pag.* 5. *That elect infants belong to Chriſt, not in regard of viſible conſtitution, but myſticall union.* Is there a myſticall union
Pſal. 51. 5. with Chriſt of thoſe that are unconverted to Chriſt? they are conceived in ſin, and they doe not carry with them this ſin pollution into heaven; it is therefore both by election and converſion that they are made partakers of the thing ſignified in Baptiſme.

This is the ſumme (you ſay) *of Maſter Blakes arguments only,* he &c. which digreſſion of yours, I ſhall leave till your arguments are examined.

Arg. 5. A beleever can in the behalf of his infant make good ſuch a title, to the inward covenant, that none can ſay, thou haſt no part nor portion in this thing, and becauſe it cannot be denied, it is to be preſumed.

Rep. This is one, but none of the ſumme, it came in (it ſeemes) after the reckoning was made up, and indeed it is none of Mr. *Blakes* arguments, as the Reader may ſee, if he pleaſe to view the place it ſelf, page 21. not 29. both the propoſitions of his ſyllogiſme are there laid down, with their proof before this paſſage for amplification; is brought, when you give any anſwer to the argument it ſelf, you may heare of a reply.

Ibid. *Theſe are all the arguments that are worth examining, which M.* Blake *hath, ſave ſome common objections I have elſe-where anſwered, only ſome equivocate ſpeeches that delude the Reader.*

Reply. Sure the Reader may find ſome more, which deſerve as learned an anſwer as hath been returned to theſe which you have mentioned. For *equivocate ſpeeches*, I confeſſe, but not to delude the Reader:

Reader: an equivocate ſpeech cannot delude a Reader. There is *æquivocum æquivocans, & æquivocum æquivocatum*; an equivocating ſpeech in the preſent tenſe, and an equivocate ſpeech in the preter tenſe: If I ſay, a *dog*, this is an equivocating ſpeech, ſeeing the meaning may be, a *dog upon earth*, or a dog in the heavens, the *dog-ſtar*, or a *dog in the ſeas*: but when I mention one of theſe kinds with its difference, as to ſay, an *houſe-dog*, this is an equivocate ſpeech, and ſuch indeed were my ſpeeches. You inſtance in ſuch ſpeeches that you call equivocate: *In nature children are their parents, in covenant Gods. Every Chriſtian parent hath a child of God committed to his care and tuition, which is by the booke, unleſſe he meane a child of Gods creating, or maintaine a falling away from grace.*

Theſe words are indeed equivocate, not equivocating, ſeeing the whole diſcourſe (eſpecially the ſtating of the queſtion in the opening of the Text) abundantly ſhewes what is meant by *ſons of God* in that place, even the ſame that is meant, *Rom.* 9.5. *by adoption*, which belongs to the whole body of the people of the Jews, the ſons of *Abrahams* loynes, and thoſe of the ſame faith made Proſelytes, and their ſeed who are called alſo *children of God*, *Deu.* 14.1. And I hope that is according to the book, where it is ſaid that the *children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt out*: children of the Kingdom, are children of God, the Kingdom being Gods; and that ſpeech alſo of *Moſes*, *The ſons of God ſaw the daughters of men*, and yet in neither of theſe is falling from grace maintained: All within the Church, that profeſſe the worſhip of God, go under the name of the *children of God*, when thoſe that are without go under name *of dogs*, which ſtill holds, and therefore *Iohn*, when he deſcribes the Church in her greateſt purity, ſaith, *without are dogs*. All within (where there are ſome bad fiſh, and ſome tares) are children: All the Galathians *were children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, and their faith was of ſundry kindes, as that Epiſtle doth clearly manifeſt, ſome fall from faith, ſome make ſhipwrack of faith, and in ſome kind fall from their ſon-ſhip; there is therefore a third diſtinct kind of ſons, more then by *creation*, and yet not by *election or regeneration*, ſons by an *outward call of the Word*, and no call *according to purpoſe by the Spirit*.

Reply. Mat. 8.12. Gen. 6.1. Mat. 15.26. Rev. 22.15. Gal. 3.26. Luk. 8.13. 1 Tim. 1.13.

I will be the God of thee and thy ſeed, therefore all beleevers are in covenant with God, and are to be ſealed. *Object. 6. Pag* 68.

Reply. We doe not maintain an undoubted participation of the inward grace in all Infants, nor in any one particular Infant, no more than you are able to maintain in profeſſours; But a capacity of the inward grace, we ſay, is the ſame in Infants and grown perſons. In this gradation of yours, in which you ſpeak of Infants, we can goe along with you, and apply it unto grown perſons.

Though ſome are partakers of the inward grace, it is in reſpect of election, and not of actuall converſion.

Reply. Election of Infants is here by you granted, but all converſion denied: how then are all dying Infants, or any Infants dying ſaved, ſeeing that of the Apoſtle is univerſall? *Fleſh and blood cannot in-*
1 Cor. 15. 50. *herit the kingdome of God.* And I pray reconcile this with your own words, *pag.* 5. *That elect infants belong to Chriſt, not in regard of viſible conſtitution, but myſticall union.* Is there a myſticall union
Pſal. 51. 5. with Chriſt of thoſe that are unconverted to Chriſt? they are conceived in ſin, and they doe not carry with them this ſin pollution into heaven; it is therefore both by election and converſion that they are made partakers of the thing ſignified in Baptiſme.

This is the ſumme (you ſay) of Maſter *Blakes arguments only,* he &c. which digreſſion of yours, I ſhall leave till your arguments are examined.

Arg. 5. A beleever can in the behalf of his infant make good ſuch a title, to the inward covenant, that none can ſay, thou haſt no part nor portion in this thing, and becauſe it cannot be denied, it is to be preſumed.

Rep. This is one, but none of the ſumme, it came in (it ſeemes) after the reckoning was made up, and indeed it is none of Mr. *Blakes* arguments, as the Reader may ſee, if he pleaſe to view the place it ſelf, page 21. not 29. both the propoſitions of his ſyllogiſme are there laid down, with their proof before this paſſage for amplification; is brought, when you give any anſwer to the argument it ſelf, you may heare of a reply.

Ibid. *Theſe are all the arguments that are worth examining, which M.* Blake *hath, ſave ſome common objections I have elſe-where anſwered, only ſome equivocate ſpeeches that delude the Reader.*

Reply. Sure the Reader may find ſome more, which deſerve as learned an anſwer as hath been returned to theſe which you have mentioned. For *equivocate ſpeeches*, I confeſſe, but not to delude the Reader:

Reader: an equivocate ſpeech cannot delude a Reader. There is *aquivocum æquivocans, & æquivocum æquivocatum*; an equivocating ſpeech in the preſent tenſe, and an equivocate ſpeech in the preter tenſe: If I ſay, a *dog*, this is an equivocating ſpeech, ſeeing the meaning may be, a *dog upon earth*, or a dog in the heavens, the *dog-ſtar*, or a *dog in the ſeas*: but when I mention one of theſe kinds with its difference, as to ſay, an *houſe-dog*, this is an equivocate ſpeech, and ſuch indeed were my ſpeeches. You inſtance in ſuch ſpeeches that you call equivocate: *In nature children are their parents, in covenant Gods. Every Chriſtian parent hath a child of God committed to his care and tuition, which is by the booke, unleſſe he meane a child of Gods creating, or maintaine a falling away from grace.*

Reply. Theſe words are indeed equivocate, not equivocating, ſeeing the whole diſcourſe (eſpecially the ſtating of the queſtion in the opening of the Text) abundantly ſhewes what is meant by *ſons of God* in that place, even the ſame that is meant, *Rom.* 9. 5. *by adoption*, which belongs to the whole body of the people of the Jews, the ſons of *Abrahams* loynes, and thoſe of the ſame faith made Proſelytes, and their ſeed who are called alſo *children of God*, *Deu.* 14. 1. And I hope that is according to the book, where it is ſaid that the *children of the Kingdom ſhall be caſt out*: children of the Kingdom, are children of God, the Kingdom being Gods; and that ſpeech alſo of *Moſes*, *The ſons of God ſaw the daughters of men*, and yet in neither of theſe is falling from grace maintained: All within the Church, that profeſſe the worſhip of God, go under the name of the *children of God*, when thoſe that are without go under name *of dogs*, which ſtill holds, and therefore *Iohn*, when he deſcribes the Church in her greateſt purity, ſaith, *without are dogs*. All within (where there are ſome bad fiſh, and ſome tares) are children: All the Galathians *were children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, and their faith was of ſundry kindes, as that Epiſtle doth clearly manifeſt, ſome fall from faith, ſome make ſhipwrack of faith, and in ſome kind fall from their ſon-ſhip; there is therefore a third diſtinct kind of ſons, more then by *creation*, and yet not by *election or regeneration*, ſons by an *outward call of the Word*, and no call *according to purpoſe by the Spirit*.

Mat. 8. 12. Gen. 6. 1. Mat. 15. 26. Rev. 22. 15. Gal 3. 26. Luk. 8. 13. 1 Tim. 1. 13.

Obiect. 6. *Pag* 68. I will be the God of thee and thy ſeed, therefore all beleevers are in covenant with God, and are to be ſealed.

Reply. Was there ever answer so throughly done as this answer, in lesse than halfe a sheet of paper? The summe of the arguments are first answered, and then all the arguments, and now one more than all followes. I would intreat you to gratifie the Reader with the page in the *Birth-Priviledge*, where this argument thus formed may be found.

Pag. 68. *To all former answers, See Object. 2,3. Ile only adde, that if this Covenant with* Abraham *was the Covenant of grace, yet was it made with the children of promise onely, which are believers of Jew and Gentile, and not their seed; many whereof are wicked, and proffered only to the carnall seed that were circumcised, and not made nor covenanted with them.*

Reply. 1. You make an oppositon betweeen the children of the Promise and the carnall seed, as though all children of Promise were spirituall. But this is a mistake of Scripture language, *The children of Promise* are those that are borne to *Abraham*, according to the promise made of God, All *Isaacks* seed after the flesh are within the Promise, in whom the seed was called, *Esau* and his posterity excepted, who are exempted by a speciall oracle from heaven, when *Esau* was together with *Jacob* in the wombe, See *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

2. You make a distinction between the *proffer of the Covenant*, and *the making of it*. It was *proffered*, not *made* (you say) with the *wicked and carnall*: But so far as they did accept and receive it; it was *made*, as well as *proffered*. They do professedly, in a visible way, accept the *Tables of this Covenant* in the Word, together with the *Seale*: So they are in Scripture language called a *Covenant people*, *Believers*, *Saints*: And respectively to all that is visible they are such, so called of men, and intitled by God to all ordinances and priviledges, though respectively to Heaven there must be a further work (to which these Covenants and Seales tend) before they have a faith to entitle them to Heaven. *Fides quam credimus*, the doctrine of Faith profest, gives a *Church-right*, and these are in Covenant: *Fides qua credimus*, the faith whereby we live in Christ, only gives a *Heaven-right*, that entitles to everlasting life. And seeing you referre the Reader for further answer to to your 2. and 3. Objection, those here in this discourse of the Covenant, and inference from it, must be examined.

They

Mr. Blackwood. *Pag.34.*

They that are in Covenant muſt be ſealed with the ſeale thereof: But Infants are in Covenant. *Object.2.*

We deny the propoſition. *Anſw.*

But why is it here denyed? and when you have to deale with your objector it is yeelded, ſee Mr. *Blackwoods* Anſwer to the 4th. Objection of the *B. P.* For your reaſon, you ſay *Reply.* *Pag.82.*

The Covenant in times paſt belonged to the females of the Jewes, yet they were not to be ſealed with the ſeale of the Covenant for want of a command. *Ibid.*

This we finde often over in your book: but, *Reply.*

1. I pray you was there not more in it then the want of a command? was there not an expreſſe reſtriction to the *Males*? was there not a want of capacity in the *Females*? Suppoſe a command of cutting off, or ſhaving the beards of the *Males* at eight dayes old, ſuch would the command have been of Circumciſing of Females.

2. A command in particular needes not, the ſeale of right belongs to men in Covenant. Thoſe that are Chriſts people, muſt be received into the number: thoſe that are Chriſts muſt be brought and dedicated to Chriſt, a *ſeale, a way of entrance, and dedication to Chriſt*, being appointed, none that are Chriſts (unleſſe there be ſome expreſſe reſtraint) muſt be denied.

3. We have a command to ſeale all in Covenant, go Diſciple all nations, *diſcipling and covenanting* are one and the ſame, when *a Kingdom* (according to the Prophecy) *is made the Lord Chriſts*, then that kingdom is in Covenant, Diſcipled, and to be baptized.

2. *I anſwer to the aſſumption, Infants of godly parents are in Covenant, then this Covenant is either the Covenant of grace, made with the elect, or ſome outward Covenant.* *Ibid.*

The members of your diſtinction are not oppoſite, but ſubordinate, and ſo coincident. The latter is ſubordinate unto, and ſerves the former, the outward Covenant is of grace: much is ſpoke of the great love, and free grace of God in vouchſafeing it to a people, you know there is a *gratia gratis data*, grace freely given, and there is *gratia gratum faciens*, making men acceptable to God, the former in Gods ordinary diſpenſation, is the way to the later. For your reaſons, *Reply.* *Pſ.147.ult.*

Ibid. 1. *Those that are in the Covenant of grace made with the elect, cannot fall away, but these fall away.*

Reply. There needs not that part of the Covenant which is proper to the elect, to give a right to the Seale; But the outward part is enough, the Seale being outward, and both the outward part of the Covenant, and the Seale (being the Ordinances of God to effect the inward) doe effect it in the elect, which to us is secret.

Ibid. 2. *The Covenant of Grace with the elect, hath sundry branches not competible to the seed of the godly: as, that their sins shall be forgiven them, They shall all be taught of God.*

Reply. That branch of the Covenant that is competible to them, is sufficient to denominate them Covenant-ones, and to give them right to the seales of the Covenant.

Ibid. *Or else this Covenant is outward, and so the bond on Abraham and his seeds part is Circumcision,* Gen.17.10. Act.7.8.

Reply. The bond on that part of *Abrahams* seed which are of the un-
Rom.4.11. circumcision, is not circumcision.

Ibid. *If Circumcision be the Covenant it selfe, and so the Covenant be outward, then is the land of Canaan only the counterpart.*

Reply. Was there ever any that thought Circumcision was the Covenant it selfe? They are men that give little heed to the Apostles Comment upon it, who makes it not the Covenant, but the signe and seale of it. You truly say, that *they that urge Circumcision to be the Covenant it selfe, run upon this absurdity, to make the Covenant and Seale to be one and the same thing.* It were well such absurd ones were known.

Ibid. *Those that alleadge this, must disclaime Circumcision from being a seale of the righteousnesse of faith.*

Reply. Yea, and from being any seale at all.

Pag.34,35. *Also they must cease to fly betwixt two lurking holes, sometimes to say Circumcision is a seale of the Covenant made with the elect; And when they dispute in another place, they only make it an outward Covenant.*

Reply. I would you would name the man that makes it any Covenant at all: Perhaps in some ones writings it may be so called, as the bread in the Sacrament is called the body of Christ; but those *Metonymies* I had hoped had been well understood, And I suppose you can scarce meet with your own match in such a way of lurking that you there mention.

Bap-

Baptiſme is no outward Covenant, and therefore cannot ſucceed Circumciſion in any ſuch identity, but as a ſigne or ſeale of an inward Covenant, &c. Pag. 35.

And why may not *Baptiſme*, which is no outward Covenant, but a ſeale of an inward, ſucceed *Circumciſion*, that was no Covenant, but a ſeale of the ſelf-ſame inward Covenant, even *Circumciſion of the heart*? And though Baptiſme be a ſeale of an inward grace, yet ſure it is (as Circumciſion was) an outward ſeale, and to be diſpenſed where the proffer or tender of the inward grace or covenant is made and accepted. The inward ſeale is given only where the inward work is wrought, and this ſeale is the Spirit. The outward is tendred, that the inward work may be wrought, and more and more increaſed. *Reply.*

Abraham had but three ſeeds:

1. *Chriſt*, Gal. 3. 16.
2. *The carnall Jew.*
3. *Believers of Jewes and Gentiles: We Gentiles come to be the ſeed of Abraham only this way.*

Now many miſtake beſide theſe three ſeeds (which are all the ſeed that Scripture names) a fourth ſeed, that is, the ſeed of beleevers, unto which they think God will be a God, becauſe they are ſuch, which cannot be, becauſe many of them prove wicked.

To which of theſe three ſeeds will you referre proſelytes of the Gentiles in the time of the Law, and their ſeed? Theſe were none of the ſeed of *Abrahams* fleſh, neither will you yield that all of them were believers. Theſe make up a fourth, I am ſure they are none of the three: And ſo doe all of *Abrahams* faith, that is, of *Abrahams* religion, and their ſeed, as both the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament doe witneſſe. *Abrahams* faith profeſt with the mouth, though not rooted in the heart, makes *Abrahams* ſeed, and gives right of outward priviledge as large as *Abraham* had. They are now holy branches, reſpective to thoſe that went before them, and an holy root, reſpective to thoſe that follow after them. If you take the third branch of your diviſion in it's juſt latitude, for all that hold the doctrine of faith with their ſeed, We then acknowledge that your diviſion is full: but if you put your own reſtraint upon it, to underſtand no faith but ſaving, a fourth muſt be added, namely all that imbrace the Religion of Chriſt, with their off- *Reply.*

ſpring,

ſpring, theſe are of the faith of *Abraham*, and theſe have the promiſe as *Abraham* had, they are holy to the Lord, root and branch, firſt fruit and lump.

Your Anſwer being found as it is, now I muſt look into your digreſſion: when you have mentioned one onely Argument in the Birth-priviledge, *for Baptiſme of Infants*, you conclude, *This is the ſumme of Mr.* Blakes *Arguments*; where you adde,

Pag. 66. *Only he breaks out with many aſperſions to render us odious* p. 17. *As, that the Anabaptiſts of this preſent Age ſaile between two rocks, either to affirme that Infants die in their pollution, and periſh in their birth-ſinne; or elſe to deny this originall pollution, or any birth ſinne at all: The later of the two they therefore generally chuſe, judging it more faire to deny Infants ſinne, than to affirme their condemnation.*

The Arguments *few*, and the Aſperſions *many!* Of all Books, I have ever eſteemed thoſe the moſt unworthy; and if I ſhould now be guilty, I ſhould be the firſt in my own cenſure. You are at pains to name but one page, in which theſe aſperſions (to make odious) are to be found, and that you confeſſe to be with *ſome evaſion*, as you terme it. I had thought the greateſt Adverſary would have cleered that paper from any ſuch blots. That which offends you, is

1. The title or name given.
2. The opinion that is charged upon you.

That title, *the Anabaptiſts of this preſent Age*, troubles you: In which, if you examine the bare ſignification of the word, a more gentle terme cannot be given to men of your opinion. An *Anabaptiſt* is a man for rebaptiſme: our Baptiſme in Infancy you recall as inſufficient, and maintaine a neceſſity of a ſecond Baptiſme. It is true, that in the common uſe of the word it comprehends all thoſe tenents which the men of that way uſually maintaine, which in former times they have been wont to hold, which would make a liſt far more large than that which you here complain of. So that you might have ſeen a more candid way of dealing, then to have deſerved ſuch a cenſure. 1. Diſtinguiſhing *Anabaptiſts* of this Age from thoſe of former times, who have denied the *humanity of Chriſt, the power of the Civill Magiſtrate, the lawfulneſſe of an Oath*; have maintained a *community of goods and poſſeſſions*. None of theſe are now charged upon thoſe of this Age, and thoſe only

are

are here named, which commonly in our times by them are maintained. 2. Putting a difference between thoſe that begin to ſet this way, and have not waded ſo deep (that think they can make good the unlawfulnes of Infants Baptiſme, in a *more innocent way, keeping their judgments without taint of the errors mentioned*) and others that hold theſe opinions here recited; So that the *Anabaptiſts* of the preſent time, have no cauſe to complaine, having no more laid to their charge then that which they are content to own: And others who have not drunke in theſe opinions, may ſee all candid dealing uſed, the very name ſpared, and not attributed, when yet (as we ſee in your papers) they are too zealous for the thing it ſelfe.

For the opinions charged, you are not pleaſed to heare it ſaid, that thoſe that joyne in this Covenant *ſaile between thoſe two rockes, either, &c.* To the one of theſe we ſtill ſay your doctrine tends, but it was never in my thoughts that I ſhould have met with a man that would ſplit himſelf upon both, which yet is your fate, out of which you will hardly ever deliver your ſelf, without ſome notable contradiction. *Infants* with you are ſo under wrath, that they are uncapable of the ſeale of grace: That wrath which they inherit debars them of that favour, and how theſe can be ſaved I would faine underſtand: doth God give them Chriſt in love? and doth he withhold this ſeale in wrath? For originall ſinne, you confeſſe indeed the defilement, but deny the guilt: It is ſuch a ſinne in which all are borne, but none ſuffer for it: And then how they are borne children of wrath, is no leſſe then a *riddle*. *Gelaſius* reckoning up certaine heads of Pelagianiſme, makes this to be one: *Parvulos ſine ſacro baptiſmate pro ſolo originali peccato non poſſe damnari. Infants dying without baptiſme, cannot be damned for originall ſinne alone.* How you can waſh it off, I doe not know.

Pag. 11.

Ibid.

Refert Voſſius de hæreſi Pelagij, circa peccatum Originale. Pag. 615.

The faireſt language that could be found, was given to thoſe that entertaine this ſingle Doctrine, without any other taint of errour; but a man of your minde could not be ſo much as dream't on, to involve them all under wrath, that they *may not be baptized*, and with the ſame breath, to extend ſo large grace, that all of them dying *are neceſſarily ſaved*.

This language (as gentle as words could expreſſe) with you is no leſſe then *reviling, perſecuting*; but with you there muſt be no ſuch

returne you ſay, (*as evill for evill, but after the example of the*
Pag.67. *Lord, who when he was reviled, reviled not againe, when he was perſecuted, threatned not*) when the Reader (I ſuppoſe) will ſoon confeſſe, that you have in this kind returned far more then ever you received: To make the Churches of the Saints *Garriſon-keepers for Antichriſt*, with you is faire language: To ſingle out two brethren in the forefront, as champions to ſerve ſuch a maſter, To make arguments of your own, and father them upon your objector (that ſo he may ſtand in compariſon with a *certaine Atheiſt*) is neither reviling nor perſecution.

But you deſire not, you ſay, *for feare of perſecution, to wink against*
Ibid. *the light the Lord hath let you ſee.* And let me intreate you not to cloſe them faſt againſt that light which is offered you to be ſeen: certaine it is that you have light enough to ſee the untruth of much of that which you have delivered; there needs no other but M. *Blackwood* againſt Mr. *Blackw.* in ſeverall particulars for confutation: And this of perſecution is one of your grand deſignes to fetch in proſelytes, when yet ſuch as this, I ſuppoſe, is almoſt of the formidableſt that you ſuſpect, as appeares by the ſeaſon in which you appeare with
See Mr. *Black.* ſuch zeale in this cauſe. It is with you a note of the true Church to be
p. 37. *anſ.* 3. perſecuted; and this uſage of yours, is your evidence amongſt your hearers, that you are one of truths defenders; How many truths have we at this time perſecuted with you? The truths of *Popery*, *Arminianiſme*, *Socinianiſme*, the truths of *Antinomianiſme*, the truth of the *Soules ſleeping, dying*: All of theſe, and more then theſe ſuffer perſecution with you, as did the truth of *Baaliſme*, and *the Sun and Hoſt of Heaven-Worſhip* under perſecuting *Aſa*, *Iehoſophat*, *Hezekiah*, and *Manaſſeh*. The truth of *Arrianiſme* under *Conſtantine*; The truth of *Antichriſtianiſme* under thoſe *Kings* and *States* that muſt *eate the fleſh of the whore*; All of theſe have like cauſe of complaint of ſuffering, and ſo goe under the ſame badge or cogniſance of truths defenders.

For your friendly admonition, to remember what my ſelf *pag.* 30. doe, ſpeake concerning perſecution I thank you, being unwilling to offend againſt my own principles, or the *generation of Gods children*; but I pray you, when Saint *Luke* ſaith concerning the ſadduAct. 23.8. ces, *that they ſay, there is no reſurrection, neither Angel nor ſpirit*, did he then perſecute? Yea ſuppoſe ſome few had been right among

mong them in the doctrine of spirits, might not this have yet been spoke, when the generality was thus tainted? If I had drawen the list to a greater length, I should have found enow to have asserted the truth of that charge; I have seen, and can bring forth complaints under the hand of some, as godly, and learned, as ever I had happines to converse with, in a far more large catalogue; Those by me mentioned were no other, then such which are more commonly held, and the tenent it self is apt to beget, and I yet cannot see a way how they can be avoyded.

A Vindication of Arguments brought for Baptisme of Infants, *by Mr. M. and others.*

Part. III.

Mr. Blackwood.

As the Infants of Jewes were Circumcised, so the Infants of Christians are to be Baptized. *Object.* 1. *Pag.* 31.

We deny the consequence.

1. *Because there are two Covenants essentially differing,* Jer. 51. 32, 33. Jer. 11. 7, 8. *Answ.*

1. This reason is not to force of overthrow this consequence, how far soever the Covenants differ; yet they both agree in this, that either is to have their seale: The severall grants made by *Ahasuerus* to *Haman*, and *Esther*, did much differ, one was for the *slaughter*, and the other for the *preservation* of the people of God, and yet either of both have the Kings seale for ratification. *Reply.* *Esther* 3. 10, Est. 8. 8.

2. Here is a new piece of Divinity taught us, that *the Covenant which Circumcision did seale to the Jewes, and the Covenant that Baptisme doth seale to Christians*, do essentially differ.

1. Then it followes that Jewes and Christians are in an estate es-

The Covenant sealed in Baptisme, and the Covenant sealed in Circumcision essentially the same.

sentially different; If the Covenant with one be, *that God will be their God*, then the other are *without God*; If the Covenant with one be of *free grace*, the other is a Covenant *of works without grace*; if the portion of the one (by vertue of the Covenant) be *salvation*, the portion of the other is *destruction*.

2. Then the thing signified in the Sacraments of Jewes and Christians should essentially differ (the thing signified in the Sacrament, is of the essence of the Covenant) but the thing signified in the Sacraments, both of Jewes and Christians, we know to be one and the same, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7: 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3. They had Christ sealed in theirs, and we have no other in our Sacraments,

3. Then the *promise of mercy to our fathers, the holy Covenant made with them, the oath sworne to* Abraham, is such, in which we are not concerned, as being under a Covenant essentially differing; but the contrary to this is plaine, *Luke* 1. 72,73. That oath to *Abraham Gen.* 22.16. (in your sense onely carnall) containes (in the interpretation of *Zachary*) that Covenant of Salvation, by us enjoyed, and in the Sacrament of the New Testament sealed.

Answ. 2. *Pag* 32.

Then the Lords Supper should be given to Infants, because they all partooke of Manna and the Paschall Lambe.

Reply.

Manna, and so the rocke, are considered two wayes.

In what sense Infants eate Manna and the Paschall Lambe.

1. *As common food, and meanes of present lively-hood and subsistence:* in this consideration Infants did indeed partake of it, and so also did their cattell, their beasts did drink of the *water*, *Num.* 20.8. and (as cannot be denyed) their domestique creatures did eate of the *Manna:* In this sense it was no Sacrament.

2. *As a visible pledge of Gods abode among them, and* (*according to promise*) *marching with them*; So it was a Sacrament leading to him, *in whom all the promises are yea and Amen.* This use, neither Infants, nor bruite creatures could make, of it, and to them it was no Sacrament.

For the Paschall Lambe; 1. How does it appeare that Infants eate of it? unlesse as they are involved in the number of the household; and so you will bring Infants within the same compasse for Baptisme, seeing households were baptized.

2. If Infants did partake of it, it was as a *common meale* to them, and no *Sacrament*, as now they may eate of that bread, and drink of that wine, which is prepared for the Lords Supper, though not in the way of a Sacrament.

3. There

3. There is no ordinance requiring Infants to repaire to the place that God chose for it, It is for those males (saith *Ainsworth*) which were *freemen, perfect males, and in health, able to go up to the place of publike Worship*; where he quots the *Rabbies* authority, *That all men are bound, except the deaf, and the dumbe, and the fool, and the little child, and the blind, and the lame, and the uncircumcised, and the old men, and the sicke, and the tender and the weake, that were not able to goe on their feet.* When we read of the pains that they took to goe up to *Jerusalem* on these occasions, *through the valley of Baca*, we hear nothing of their pains to carry along their Infants, which must have been their care, if by divine appointment the Paschall Lambe, as a Sacrament, had been ordained for Infants. *Ainsworth on Ex.23.17.* *Psal.84.6.*

Circumcision was commanded as well to reprobates, as to the elect Genesis. 17.10. *every male child among you shall be circumcised, among which were many reprobates.*, Esau *was circumcised, so* Ishmael. *Ibid.*

Where is that command of circumcision of reprobates? or restraint of Baptisme to elect ones? reprobates were within the compasse of those that were *to be circumcised*, and so they are within the compasse of those who according to Christs commission are to *be baptized*: you can instance in reprobates circumcised, and we can give as cleer instances in such baptized. Sacraments being outward visible seales, they doe not at all look at election or reprobation, which are both invisible, But at the externall, and visible being in Covenant. *Reply:*

Baptisme and Circumcision doe much differ, first, &c. *Ibid.*

Here you are at paines to reckon up many differences between Baptisme and Circumcision, to which though many more might be added, yet in this you are wanting, that upon your naming of these severall differences, you do not inferre your reason, that for this cause Infants might (yea must) be circumcised, and for this cause may not be baptized. These differences (for ought that appears from you to the contrary) may stand (with a more large addition to the number) and yet the consequence by you denied still remaine firme, differences in the outward signe and ministeriall way of dispensation being wholly besides the purpose. Suppose some privilege should now be claimed to be conferred by the Great Seale on an infant, and precedents in Queen *Elizabeths* dayes produced of *Reply.*

like Patents by her ordinarily paſt, Would it ſerve (for deniall of ſuch claime) to anſwer? That that Queens ſeal did much differ from His Majeſties, Her ſtampe was one, His Majeſties another, She had one Lord *Keeper*, His Majeſty hath others. A *Herald* would ſoone furniſh a man with multitude of differences, and a *Lawyer* would as ſoon make reply, that theſe were vaine and impertinent ones, It is not the ſtampe of the ſeale, nor the man that hath it in cuſtody, that is materiall, but the power of the Crowne to grant, and the right of the ſubject, in whoſe name the claime is made. So it is here, while there is a grant from Heaven extending it ſelfe to Infants, all theſe differences here reckoned of circumciſion the *eight day*, *Baptiſme any day*, *circumciſion on the males*, *Baptiſme on males and females*, &c. to which adde as many more as you pleaſe (as to the purpoſe in hand) all are frivolous, unleſſe you could inferre that an infant on the eight day is in ſuch a capacity as no other day, Infant-males in their ſex apart, are in a high place of priviledge beyond the condition of females, *&c.*

For the fifth difference that you aſſigne, *that circumciſion was a profeſſion of the obſervation of the Law, But Baptiſme ſignifies forgiveneſſe of ſins*, I ſhall examine in the anſwer of your fifth Objection; only it was here expected that you ſhould have applyed the difference, and to have made it appear how Infants could know the Law, or make profeſſion of it, (and ſo were capable of circumciſion) but were in no capacity of the forgiveneſſe of ſinne, and therefore are uncapable of Baptiſme: otherwiſe this difference (as the reſt) makes no diſtinction.

Pag. 34. *The Sacraments of the New Teſtament cannot be proved but by the Scripture of the New Teſtament: Therefore the conſequence that is drawne from the Old Teſtament is abſurd.*

Reply. But the Sacraments of both Teſtaments may be compared, that from both together, light may be gathered for the right under-

1 *Cor.* 10. 2. 3. ſtanding of all. Doth not *Pauls* ſpeech of *Manna* and the *Rock* help us in the knowledge of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper? The day of worſhip in the New Teſt. muſt be proved out of Scriptures of the New Teſtament, yet your ſelfe can make uſe of the fourth

Pag. 54. Commandement to maintain a neceſsity of the obſervation of it.

Your ſecond, and third Objections are already vindicated, and defended, See *pag.* 87, 88, 89.

Mr. Blackwood

Mr. Blackwood.

Baptisme succeeds Circumcision as an initiating signe, *Col.* 2. 12. therefore as Infants were circumcised, so they ought to be baptized. *Object.* 4.

We deny the consequence, for those in Colosse that were baptized, were not Infants, but growne persons that were circumcised with circumcision made without hands, and had faith through the operation of God. *Answ.*

This is no other then a meer *petitio principij*, a begging of the question which is in dispute, that these were baptized, and not their issue with them. Other answers given by you are grounded upon an exposition made by some on *Colloss.* 2. 12. whose exposition it is I know not, and am not minded to assert it, or reply at all to the exceptions taken at it. *Reply.*

Suppose it were granted that Baptisme did succeed circumcision, as an initiating signe, yet where is there any such thing in the text as this, viz. that Baptisme shall succeed in the same latitude of infancy? *Ibid.*

Being granted that it succeeds as an initiating signe, what else can follow, but that it succeeds in the same latitude in regard of infancy, unlesse we could find some restraint? An enlargement in regard of latitude we can shew; a restraint cannot be found: A full paralell in all particulars, (the outward signe excepted) is plaine, (in that the words are promiscuously used, *We are circumcised in him*, in that *we are buried with him in Baptisme*) In this particular of initiation into the Church, it is most plaine, and that in this latitude, Infants having now, as then, a Church right, They belong to Christ, bear his name, and of them is the Kingdome of Heaven. *Reply.*

Mr. Blackwood.

If Infants may not now be baptized, then they are deprived of some grace circumcision did conferre. *Object.* 5. *Pag.* 37.

No, for first, Circumcision did not bring any grace to the Jewes, but was rather a yoke of a curse, Acts 15. 10, 11, *what this yoke was we see,* Gal. 5. 3. Gal. 3. 10. Deut. 27. 26. *So that if you aske what circumcision was, it was the profession of observation of the Law.* *Answ.*

If the question were asked you, *what profit is there of circumcision?* You would answer, none at all, but a yoke, not a benefit, but a misery: when Saint *Paul* answered in another manner, *much* *Reply.* *Rom.* 3. 1.

every

every way: he was much miſtaken, when reckoning up the priviledges of which he might boaſt, this is the firſt, *Circumciſed the eight day*. It ſeemes to you an honour, and a benefit, to be of the uncircumciſed. Now whereas *Peter* calls it a *yoke*, and *Paul* ſaith, *he that is circumciſed is a debter to doe the whole Law*, we muſt diſtinguiſh of circumciſion, that it is conſidered either as a *Sacrament*, or elſe as a *Law-ceremony*, *as given to Abraham* as a ſigne and ſeal of Chriſt, *as enjoyned by Moſes* as one of the bulke of the Law-ceremonies, and the leading one of that number. *Conſidered as a Sacrament* received by *Abraham* for a ſigne and ſeale to him and his ſeed, ſo it was no yoke, but a ſpeciall priviledge, given him with that promiſe, *I am the alſufficient God*: and thus conſidered, it was no obligation to the Law, no engagement to make a man a debter to the Law, as a Covenant. This is plaine in that the fathers enjoyed this priviledge of circumciſion 400 yeares beforethe Law was given, and it was no engagement unto that which was not in being: and in this conſideration Baptiſme anſwers it. *Conſidered as a ceremony* of the Law, and the leading one of the bulke: it yet may be taken two wayes.

Phil. 3. 5.

Circumciſion diſtinguiſhed.

Gen. 17. 1.

1. *As a ſhadow leading unto Chriſt*, and having its end and complement in him.

2. *As of it ſelfe, without any reference unto Chriſt at all.*

Circumciſion taken in the firſt ſenſe, as a ſhadow, whereof Chriſt is the ſubſtance and the body, it is both a *priviledge*, and a *yoke*, a *mercy*, and alſo a *burden*. As ſome have obſerved of thoſe words, *In the ſweat of thy browes thou ſhalt eat thy bread*: that they containe a *curſe*, and a *promiſe*; a *curſe*, that without this paines, bread cannot be had; a *promiſe*, that upon this paines-taking bread may be obtained. So we may ſay of *Circumciſion*, together with the body of the Ceremoniall law, *It containes a burden or yoke*; in that, without ſuch a burdenſome way (both of coſt and pains) no light of attonement made by the blood of Chriſt could not be had. *It contains a priviledge*, that yet by this charge and paines in this burdenſome way, light may be ſeen. Compare a *Jew* with a *Heathen*, and his Circumciſion is a priviledge, and ſo Scripture ſpeaks of it: Light is precious let in at any crevis; The knowledge of Chriſt is happy in any ſhadow. Compare him with a Chriſtian, *before whom Chriſt is evidently ſet forth*, then it is a burden; a great mercy to enjoy

Gen. 3.

joy a more plentifull meaſure of light, in a way of more facile obſervation.

Taking Circumciſion in the ſecond acception, as of it ſelfe, without any reference to Chriſt, ſo it is a burden, and no priviledge: and ſo it was urged by the falſe teachers, and preſt upon the Galatians. VVhen the body is in ſight, we looke no longer at the ſhadow. To conclude this Reply;

In the Sacramentall uſe, it was a priviledge and ſingular advantage; the Apoſtle accounts it a ſpeciall grace, that he was circumciſed the eighth day, and ſo it plainly followes, that if Infants may not be baptized, they are deprived of that mercy that thoſe that were circumciſed in infancy did enjoy.

Mr. Blackwood.

Unleſſe Infants be baptized, they are excluded from the new Covenant. But they are not excluded, *Mat.*19.14. *Of ſuch is the kingdome of God.* *Object.6.*

We deny the conſequence; for 1. *The females of the Jewes were ſaved without Circumciſion; ſo* Job, Lot, *ſo the Canaanitiſh woman without baptiſme was in covenant with Chriſt. &c.* *Anſw.*

You uſe to put your Objection in ſuch termes that you may anſwer it with moſt advantage to your ſelfe, you might have put it, *that the viſible Church is made up of them, and therefore the ordinary gate of entrance into it, is not to be ſhut againſt them*: For circumciſion, I marvaile why you bring it in, when you have thoſe thoughts of it, that it ſealed a Covenant void of grace, For the Canaanitiſh woman, She was either baptized, or in a condition baptizable, we thinke not Baptiſme of abſolute neceſſity to the being of grace, *neceſſitate medij*, that no other way of grace can be had, But we maintain it neceſſary, *neceſſitate præcepti*, by the ordinance of Chriſt to thoſe that belong to Chriſt, and have any viſible intereſt. *Rep.*

For the aſſumption it followes not, becauſe Chriſt bade ſuffer thoſe little children, therefore that he would permit all from a particular to an univerſall, there is no conſequence, becauſe it once rained Manna, *and once water came out of the Rock, therefore it ſhall be ſo alwayes.* *Pag.* 37.

Did Chriſt bid, ſuffer theſe little children to come, pointing at thoſe individuall children in particular? Or whether are his words, ſuffer little children (giving licenſe to all within the coaſts of *Iſrael* *Rep.*

to whom he was ſent) in generall, who in his right wits would make that admiſsion only particular? And for your reaſoning of *once raining* Manna, *and water once comming out of the rock, that therefore it ſhould be ſo alwayes.* It would ſo have been alwayes, if Chriſt had given his authorative word of power to the clouds ever to have rained *Manna*, and to the rocks to have given water, as he hath his authorative command to ſuffer little children to come to him, Chriſt once ſaid, *If any man thirſt, let him come to me and drink*, He once ſaid, *come unto me all yee that labour, and are heavy laden*, yee might reſtraine theſe ſpeeches to Chriſts preſent hearers, as well as theſe words to thoſe particular Infants, and ſo any may doe that dare learne of Maſter *Blackwood* to pervert the Scriptures.

It is probable the Kingdome of glory doth in a great part conſiſt of ſuch Infants, &c.

Reply: Then by Baptiſme they are to be admitted into the ſociety of the
Act. 2. 47. viſible Church, Seeing *God addes to the Church ſuch that ſhall be ſaved*, Infancy notwithſtanding, they are ſavable, Infancy notwithſtanding, they are then baptizable; If they are in a capacity to be ſaved, they are in a capacity to be initiated.

If it ſhould be concluded, Chriſt layd his hands on them, and bleſſed them, therefore we ought ſo to doe, the concluſion were probable.

Reply. We lay not the weight of our argument on thoſe actions of Chriſt, but upon his free admiſsion, and their right to the Kingdome of Heaven, to which he gives witneſſe.

Pag. 38. *Chriſt being God, and knowing all things, his divine nature might communicate to the Humanity, that to thoſe Infants that were then brought and ſuch like as they were, the Kingdome of God did belong.*

Reply. Chriſt muſt communicate this knowledge of the Godhead to his Church, as well as to his humanity, which were elect, or elſe how could they obſerve his direction in ſuffering the elect of God to come to him, Such gloſſes are enough to overthrow all Goſpel truths.

Ibid. *Of ſuch is the Kingdome of God, there is a two-fold Suchneſſe, 1. Of perſon; 2. Of condition, no man can ſay, Chriſt ſpeakes of ſuchneſſe of perſon, becauſe they are little ones, For the Indians and Mahumitanes might come in ſo.*

Reply: Neither *Indians* nor *Mahumetans* could come in upon this admiſsion,

miſsion, The extent of his grant can reach no further in that place then to the Infants of the nation, to whom he was ſent, being *a Miniſter of the circumciſion*. And no further now, then to the Infants of discipled nations, that are the *nations of the Lord*, and of his Chriſt. Rom. 15. 8. For your other gloſſe to referre *ſuch there to humility*, *of ſuch as are like in humility is the Kingdome of God*, It is firſt, directly againſt the expreſſe letter of the text, The text is not, ſuffer *humble children*, but *little children*: Such referres to *quantity* there mentioned, not *quality*, of which nothing is ſpoken. 2. It takes all force from Chriſts argument, why ſhould little children have a priviledge to come to Chriſt, becauſe not they, but thoſe that were qualified like them, had right to heaven, ſo *Sheepe*, *Lambs*, *Doves*, *Vine-branches* might be brought in, under that, For thoſe that are qualified like them, have right to the Kingdome of heaven.

Mr. Blackwood.

Little children receive the Kingdome of God, *Mar.* 10. 15. &c. Pag. 38.

Three things are to be opened. Object. 7.

1. *What Chriſt meanes by the Kingdome of God, I take it Chriſt meanes the Kingdome of glory, though we will not much contend whether both Kingdomes, be not meant of Grace, and Glory.* Anſw.

And I take Chriſts meaning in the words, on which this diſpute is grounded, to be the viſible Church, in which ſenſe he moſt frequently takes the Kingdom of heaven. To this purpoſe Reade *Matth.* 13. and ſee how oft this phraſe is uſed, and in what ſenſe. And this meaning beſt agrees with Chriſts way of diſpute, *Suffer them to come to me, for of ſuch is the kingdom of heaven*, they are of the flock, and they muſt not be denied acceſſe to their Paſtor. Reply.

2. *What is meant by receiving, whoſoever ſhall not receive, &c.*

This is no part of Chriſts argumentation, but his inſtruction or application, not to infants, but to men of yeares, reſembling infants, and therefore it is not pertinent to examine. Reply.

3. *What is meant by little child, or children:*

Little children or infants are to be conſidered two wayes: Anſw.

1. *Collectively, and that two wayes.*

1. In an univerſall collection, *for all infants that ſhall be born, whether they live or die; of theſe we cannot affirm Chriſts words to be truth, that theſe receive the Kingdom of God, unleſſe we maintain falling from grace, that they once had received it, but were after faln from it.* Pag. 39.

Reply. As much truth is in Chriſts words, being underſtood of infants in an univerſall collection, as there is, when he ſaith, *The Kingdome of God is like unto a net caſt into the Sea*, that gathers of every kind, *Mat.13.47.* *Mat.22.2.* *That it is like a certain King that made a marriage for his ſon*, unto which thoſe are called, that after are caſt out. Thoſe that prove bad, and thoſe that prove good, are both within the Kingdom, and therefore no ſuch art is neceſſary to diſtinguiſh them, this is the Scripture language of the Kingdom of heaven. I would fain know what truth there is in theſe words, *Luk.8.13.* *that they on the rock beleeve*, Beleevers are in the Kingdom of heaven, Bad ones, which are bad ground, do beleeve: The Kingdom of heaven then is taken in that notion, that it comprehends all of a viſible title, in which number Chriſt places infants, among which there are *bad fiſh, bad ground, tares, and ſuch that want a wedding garment.* Chriſt maintains not a falling away from grace, and yet he makes theſe to be in the Kingdom of heaven, as living where Scepter of his kingdom rules.

Pag.39. 2. *In a partiall collection for all infants ſo dying; in this ſenſe Chriſts words would import, that all ſuch goe to heaven, and ſo it would not follow that they ſhould be baptized, becauſe we know not certainly which will dye or live, and therefore though the dying infant go to heaven, yet can no Miniſter baptiſe it, becauſe he cannot know infallibly that it will dye, till it be dead: nor hath the Miniſter any ſuch command ſo to do.*

Rep. You pleaſe your ſelfe very much with that diſtinction of Infants dying, and Infants growing up, when Chriſt makes no ſuch difference, and you are very willing to conclude, that all dying ones are generally ſaved, as *Pag.11.* you profeſſe your thoughts: yet whether their innocency, or Chriſts death ſaves them, you can ſcarce tell how to determine: for you aſsigne both for reaſons of this your opinion, *pag.34.* you will have no infant to be in covenant, yet all of them dying to be ſaved, He that would take pains to kill them, might put them all into covenant. *Herod* did that office for all in *Bethlehem*. The Scripture ſaith that *happy ſhall he be that taketh the little ones of* Babylon, *and daſheth them againſt the ſtones*, *Mat.2.* *Pſal.137.9.* you ſay that he brings them to happines, and placeth them in Heaven: their innocency is the ſame as others in reſpect of actuall ſinne, which is one reaſon you give of their ſalvation: For your inference, that yet they may not be baptized, *ſeeing we know not certainly*

which

which will dye or live: There are doubtleſſe oftentimes infallible ſymptomes of death, and far more evident ſignes (all wil yeeld) then you can finde of election, in any that make profeſſion, when yet the hope of their election in judgement of charity, is your ground of their Baptiſme, And that Chriſt intends not ſuch a limit, as to underſtand only dying Infants, when he ſaith, *ſuffer little children to come to me*, all will (I ſuppoſe) acknowledge.

Mr. *Blackwood*.

Act. 2.38,39. When *Peter* exhorted his hearers to repent and be baptized, he uſeth an argument from the benefit that ſhould come to their poſterity, for the promiſe is to you and your children. *Object.8. pag.40.*

1. *The word children, doth in Scripture, ſignifie men*, Mar.10.44. Joh.8.39. Gal.4.19. *Anſw.*

It ſo ſignifies men, that it doth not exclude Infants, the promiſe is to children, and Infants, as well as men, are children. *Reply.*

2. *This place is not a promiſe, but a proffer of a promiſe, to perſons, not actually converted, but in a way of converſion.* *Ibid.*

I cannot reach this diſtinction, between a *promiſe* and a *proffer of a promiſe* by an Apoſtle; If his dealing was reall, then the promiſe, by him proffered, muſt be a reall promiſe, He tenders it from the mouth of God, and God doth not make proffers of that which is not; The thing promiſed is contained in the promiſe, and this from God he did tender to theſe hearers, both forgiveneſſe of ſins, and the gift of the Holy Ghoſt. *Reply.*

3. *If there were any promiſe, then it muſt be either remiſſion of ſins, or the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, had it been any other promiſe ſave remiſſion of ſins, it had not been a ſalve for the ſore of a guilty Conſcience* *Ibid.*

Paul may ſerve for a comment on *Peter*, *Peter* hath here to deale with Jewes, and *Paul* tells us what promiſes did belong to them, *Rom* 9.4. *and Rom.*3.1. *compared*: Theſe promiſes are ſaving Ordinances, in which there is a tender of all promiſes, look into *Peters* own words *Act.*3.25. and you will ſee that he meanes the ſame thing, you ſay *this had been no ſalve for a guilty Conſcience*, reade the whole ſpeech of *Peter Act.*3.(from *v.*17. to the end) & you wil find him to be of an other mind, Are Scriptures promiſes, in which Chriſt is contained, and tendred, no ſuch ſalve? ſo the Apoſtle had no ſalve at all, he could not apply the plaſter of remiſſion of ſins, any other way then in the promiſe of the word, which *Reply.*

their faith was to receive, to make it effectuall, no ſalve was in his power more then miniſteriall.

Ibid. *But it cannot be the promiſe of forgiveneſſe of ſinne, becauſe many children of godly parents prove wicked, which if they do, having formerly had a promiſe of forgiveneſſe of ſins, and of the Holy Ghoſt, then* 1. *Either God falls from his promiſe, which is blaſphemy to ſay, or* 2. *The child is falne from grace.*

Rep. It is but a little below Blaſphemy, to charge God with ſuch a thing, as falling from his promiſe upon this occaſion, you tender promiſes to your people, reall promiſes, to all your people, and yet it will not follow that either all their ſins are forgiven, or that God fayles of his promiſe. Baptiſme is for remiſſion of ſinnes, though *Judas* and *Magus* have not their ſinnes remitted, Goſpel promiſes are promiſes, and Sacramentall ſeales are ſeales, though they be refuſed or hypocritically received.

The promiſes of the Goſpell, and Sacramentall ſeales are conſidered.

1. As tendred in the Ordinances.
2. As in the ſoul received, and by faith applyed.

As miniſterially tendred in the Ordinance, it is onely conditionall, and is no tye to God in any abſolute way to performance, till our faith make the engagement full and complete; So that *Promiſe* in this text, and *Rom.* 9 4. and *Covenant Acts* 3.25. is no other then a juſt title to Goſpell Ordinances, contayning miniſterall, conditionall promiſes, which the Apoſtle tells them are theirs, and their childrens, and ſtill remaine in as full a latitude, as at firſt they were to their father *Abraham.*

Pag. 41. *The Apoſtle doth not as the objector ſuppoſeth, uſe an argument to his hearers to repent and be baptized, from the benefit that ſhould come to their poſterity.*

Reply. Your objectors words are, In the ſame latitude as the promiſe is laid down, the encouragement is alſo urged to receive the ſigne and ſeale of it, But the encouragement is laid down in that latitude to comprehend converts and their ſeed.

Birth-Pri. pag. 15.

Ibid. *But anſwers a queſtion, which troubled conſciences pricked for their killing the Lord of life, made,* viz. What ſhall we do to be ſaved? *to whom Peter ſaid,* repent, and be baptized in the name of Chriſt, for remiſſion of ſinnes.

And

And in the anſwer of this queſtion, he preſcribes the uſe of this Ordinance, the ſigne and ſeale of Baptiſme, and to perſwade to the uſe of it, he produceth the promiſe in the ſame latitude, that it was by God himſelf delivered.

They further ſcrupled, what ground have you for this? to whom Peter *propounds the univerſality of the promiſe, viz.* It is to you, to your children, to all that are afar off, even as many as God ſhall pleaſe in time effectually to call.

That word *effectually* is your addition, not onely to the words, but the ſence of Scriptures, which is evidently manifeſt, in that theſe *a far off whom God ſhould call*, are in the ſelf ſame condition by calling, as the children of theſe preſent hearers: But all their children had not an *effectuall call*, It is therefore a calling with right to the ordinances, ſuch a calling that many enjoy, and are not choſen, and therefore not *effectually called according to Gods purpoſe.* *Reply.*

They further ſcrupled, we have contracted guilt on our children, by wiſhing Chriſts blood to be on them as well as our ſelves; to this Peter *ſaith, the promiſe is to you and your children.* *Ibid.*

Whence is there any colour for ſuch a conjecture? you are bold in your gueſſe, and very peremptory in your aſſertions, It cannot be affirmed, that theſe individuall Jewes, had ſo much as heard of that imprecation, which was vttered by ſome few ringleaders of Chriſts perſecutors, much leſſe that now it was in their thoughts, I am glad your objector hath taken you off from that gloſſe, which the author of the vanity of childiſh Baptiſme hath put on this Scripture. *Reply.*

1. *There was none in that place baptized, but thoſe that gladly received the word*, ver. 41.

1. No Infants came to the feaſt, at that time.
2. It is not denyed that Infants were baptized.
3. The warranty of their Baptiſme is expreſly laid down. *Reply.*

Maſter Blackwood.

The parents faith is ſufficient to receive Baptiſme. *Object. 9.*

The juſt ſhall live by his own faith, the righteouſneſſe of the righteous ſhall be upon him, Hab. 2.4. Ezek. 18.11. *Anſwer.*

He that lives by his own faith, may by that faith entitle his poſterity to the Ordinances of God. Thus the juſt did live, in the time of the Old Teſtament, and yet their faith intitled their children to *Reply.* *Hab.* 1.4.

Cir-

Circumciſion; They had that benefit by their fathers faith to be circumciſed the eighth day.

2. *What did Iſacks faith profit Eſau? or Iehoſaphats, Iehoram?*

Reply. Their faith did ſo much profit, as to entitle them to Circumciſion, inſtead of anſwering, you adde ſtrength to the objection.

Maſter Blackwood.

Object. 10. *Ibid.* Baptiſme and circumciſion are eſſentially the ſeales of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. Therefore Baptiſme ſucceeding in the roome of circumciſion, ought not to be denied to Infants, although it be the Baptiſme of faith, and repentance.

Anſwer. 1. *We deny that Circumciſion was an univerſall ſeale of faith, but was onely an individuall ſeale of the individuall faith of* Abraham, *as appeares out of the text.*

Reply. If the Covenant made of God with *Abraham* be eſſentially the ſame with that which was made with his ſeed, then the ſeale of Circumciſion, which is the ſeale of that Covenant cannot eſſentially differ, but the Covenant made of God with *Abraham*, and the Covenant made with his ſeed are one, he and they make but one party in the Covenant.

1. Covenant, and ſeale of the ſame thing, cannot eſſentially differ, but here was Covenant, and ſeale the ſame of thing.

2. It was a diſtinguiſhing ſigne in the poſterity of *Abraham*, reſpective to Religion: The circumciſed were the people of God. It was therefore a ſeale to them of that faith required of his people.

Ibid. 3. It was a ſeale of Circumciſion of the heart, which was an inward grace, the ſelf ſame that Baptiſme ſeales, *Col.* 2. 11, 12.

Reply. *The meaning may be, God would have* Abraham *circumciſed, as a note of his faith, and a memoriall and eternall monument of his fame, that he was the firſt circumciſed perſon of that nation, yet doth it not hence follow, that it was the ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith, either to* Abraham, *or his ſeed.*

Then it followes, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks not the truth; He ſayes, *Abraham* received the ſigne of Circumciſion, a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith; He ſayes not, he received it as a ſigne or note that he was the firſt circumciſed man.

Abraham received not the ſeale of the Covenant, before he firſt believed.

He

He received it when he believed, and his ſeed with him. *Reply.*

Should we grant the Argument, yet hence none ſhould be baptized, but thoſe that were grown perſons, and had the righteouſneſſe of faith, as Abraham *had at this time when he was circumciſed.* Pag. 42.

None but they and their ſeed, as it was with *Abraham.* *Reply.*

Mr. Blackwood. *Object.* 11.

Holy perſons are to be baptized, but Infants are holy, *ergo.* *Ibid.*

To the Propoſition I anſwer,

1. *Holy perſons endued with a holineſſe known to the Church, ought to be baptized: but the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of an outward holineſſe, common to the reprobate as well as the elect.* *Anſw.*

If any thing can be pickt out of this anſwer, it is, that outward holineſſe cannot be known to the Church, and in your anſwer to the Aſſumption you ſay, inward and inherent holineſſe cannot be known to the Church, and ſo no holineſſe can be known, and conſequently none are to be baptized. *Reply.*

To the aſſumption I anſwer, *Ibid.*

1. *Children in this text are not holy with a holineſſe diſtinct from Idolaters, as appeares in the repetition of the word ſanctified.*

You might have done well to have let your Reader underſtand how it appeares, ſeeing you know the contrary appeares to others. The whole power of ſanctifying is here attributed to the believing party, The unbelieving is only paſſive, and inſtrumentally ſanctified to the procreation of an holy poſterity, Being otherwiſe unholy, for this thing they are ſanctified. *Reply.*

2. *Though they were holy perſons, yet they are not to be baptized. Becauſe this holineſſe muſt either be inward and inherent, which is unknown to the Church, and ſo the Church hath nothing to diſpenſe Baptiſme; or elſe its outward, and ſo the Church cannot diſpenſe Baptiſme, becauſe Baptiſme is not a ſigne of outward holineſſe, but of the fellowſhip which the Church judgeth the baptized perſon to have in the death, buriall, and reſurrection of the Lord Jeſus.* *Ibid.*

Here is a *Dilemma*, which in caſe it be of force, your ſelfe had never yet any right to Baptiſme. The Church cannot diſpenſe it upon inward holineſſe, becauſe unknown; nor upon outward holines, for another reaſon: and all holineſſe muſt be either inward or outward. And I would know whether this fellowſhip which the Church judgeth the perſon to have in the *death, buriall, and reſurrection* *Reply.*

rection of Chriſt, be neither inward, nor outward. And indeed this judgement of charity is no ground of Baptiſme (in which the Church muſt of neceſſity more frequently erre, than hit upon truth) but a judgement of certainty, The title that the perſon is ſeen to have to thoſe ordinances which ſerve to work this fellowſhip. Neither is Baptiſme any ſeale of ſuch fellowſhip, otherwiſe than conditionall. They are put into a way to obtaine it; and when faith and other graces are wrought, (which the Apoſtle calls, *the anſwer of good conſcience towards God*) Baptiſme is a ſeale that doth aſſure it: And though it be *no ſigne of outward holineſſe*, yet it is (as Circumciſion was) the initiation of men outwardly holy into the ſociety and fellowſhip of men of ſuch holineſſe.

1 Pet. 3. 21.

Pag. 43. *To open which, conſider theſe things:*

1. *The occaſion of theſe words.*

2. *Of what holineſſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of.*

Anſw. *I will ſhew:*

1. *Negatively, he ſpeaks not of any Covenant-holineſſe which we partake from* Abraham.

1. *Becauſe it doth not agree with the context; for the queſtion was not, after what way, man, woman, or child, become holy? But whether a believer, or an unbeliever might live one with another in mariage? To which the Apoſtle anſwers affirmatively, they might live together; and gives a reaſon,* verſ. 14. *For the unbelieving husband is ſanctified in the wife. This word* For, *tells us it is a reaſon.*

Reply. How can you tell what the Corinthians ſcruple was, or their queſtion, but by the Apoſtles anſwer? And as it appeares by his anſwer, that they ſcrupled and queſtioned whether *they might live with their unbelieving yoke-fellowes.* So by his anſwer it alſo appeares, that they had a further ſcruple, and queſtion what might be thought of their Infants. Whether they were to be accounted holy, with their believing parent, or unclean, with the unbelieving one, Seeing he anſwers this as he doth the other, and this neceſſarily and naturally followes from the former, They could not queſtion one, but they muſt queſtion both. And therefore the context clearly carries it to a Covenant-holineſſe, which the ſeed of one, or both believers enjoy by vertue of their birth-priviledge.

2. *If the child be holy with a covenant-holineſſe, then is the wife holy with a covenant-ſanctification; ſo the wife, though a heathen,*

heathen, belongs to the covenant of grace.

The contrary in the Text is evident: The *wife* is ſanctified as to the bringing forth of holy iſſue; and the *iſſue*, and not the *wife*, is ſtiled holy, ſhe ſtill remaines uncleane; yet the *iſſue* is holy with the parent of an holy profeſſion, and ſo called. *Reply.*

3. *If there ſhould be any covenant-holineſſe conveyed to Gentiles, it muſt be by our being Abrams ſeed: but this is only by faith*, Gal. 3.29. *Ibid.*

And this faith, as the Text evidently ſhewes, carries the Covenant-holineſſe to poſterity. *Rep.*

2. *Poſitively, what holineſſe is here meant?*

A civill holineſſe. 1. *Of matrimoniall inſtitution, wherein God appointed man and wife to live together, which is called a holy ſtate, in oppoſition to fornicators*, 1 Theſ. 4.4,5. *And alſo, becauſe of the holy perſon who inſtituted it, and the holy end whereto it was inſtituted.* *Reply.*

I know not where it is ſo called, but in our Engliſh Common-Prayer Book, which I had thought with you had carried no ſo great authority. And you ſhould tell us how the faith of one party did conferre this civill holineſſe, that were it wanting, the child were uncleane notwithſtanding this *holy ſtate*, and *holineſſe of the perſon* that did inſtitute it. And the Reader ſhould know what is meant by this civill holines of matrimoniall inſtitution, whether that civill vertue of *Chaſtity*, of which we read in the Ethicks, which it ſeems you meane, for this is oppoſite to fornication, as the vice in extreme againſt it; And ſo the Apoſtles meaning is, *Elſe were your children fornicators, but now they are chaſte ones.* Or whether you mean by this civill holineſſe of matrimoniall inſtitution, *Legitimation*, as oppoſite to *baſtardy*, called holineſſe by a ſtrange catechreſis. If this be your meaning, I refer the (Reader for a ful anſwer) to the *Birth-Priviledge*, *pag.* 11, 12, 13. where this gloſſe is fully replied to, and ſtill remaines unanſwered. But this is not your meaning, or elſe you are aſham'd to mention it.

Reaſons why this holineſſe is here meant:

1. *It agrees with the context, He bid them dwell together*, v. 12. *Now what more favourable reaſon can there be, to the binding of a Believers conſcience, than Gods inſtitution.* *Ibid.*

But what favourable reaſon is this, that children are holy? We are upon inquiry of a reaſon of their holineſſe. And where hath the Apoſtle one word in the Text, of the author of Mariage. *Rep.*

Your ſecond poſitive reaſon, what holines is meant, is the ſame with your ſecond negative reaſon, where you had it anſwered.

Pag. 44. 3. *Becauſe this holineſſe hath a proper influence upon the children, to make them in ſome ſenſe holy,* Mal. 2. 15. *The children of one man and one woman are called a godly ſeed; So the Apoſtle here argues from contraries. If your marriage were not holy by Gods inſtitution, then your children borne in the bond of marriage were unholy,*

Reply. A holineſſe that the text never mentions, and no Scripture ſo ſtiles, hath a proper influence to make them in ſome ſenſe holy. In what ſenſe I pray? Your text of *Mal.* 2. 15. is too unſufferably abuſed, The children of one man, and woman, are not there affirmed to be *godly*, as here the children of one beleever to be holy, It was only one end of this Ordinance, and *cauſa removens impedimentum*, A means to take off one cauſe of an ungodly ſeed, which would follow upon a promiſcuous copulation, when this holineſſe here, is a neceſſary reſult and conſequence of faith in the parent; And how doth it appeare that the Apoſtle argues from the holines of Gods inſtitution, when the inſtitution is not once mentioned?

Ibid. 2. *Holineſſe, that may be meant is a holineſſe of education; When the believer and unbeliever live together, the children are in a way of being brought up godlily, whereas if they part one from another, the unbeliever will be apt to get ſome of the children, and then they will not be brought up holily.*

Reply. According to this interpretation, the children (if that *els* were not) were doubtfully uncleane, and now they are doubtfully holy, When the Apoſtle in both is peremptory, *elſe they were uncleane, but now they are holy.* The Apoſtle ſpeakes in another language, *ver.* 16. when he ſpeakes of that which may, or may not happen, and ſo here he would have ſaid, what knoweſt thou, but thy child may be holy?

Ibid. *Again we deny the conſequence, for thoſe* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *were not holier then thoſe Infants brought to Chriſt,* Math. 19. 14. *yet would not Chriſt baptiſe them, for Chriſt baptized not:* Joh. 4. 2.

Reply. Here is a reaſon to make up our mouths, reaſon growes ſcant when this muſt come in as a reaſon, Chriſt took not upon him the office of a Baptiſt, and therefore the children that were brought to him *Mat.* 19. 14. had no right to Baptiſme. Chriſt took upon him no ſuch place as to be a judge concerning inheritances, therefore Luke 12. 14. that brother that did deſire it had no right to inherit, You furniſh

us

as with a reaſon why they were not baptized, when they had right to Baptiſme.

Your Anſwers to the twelth Objection, from *Rom.*11.16. are already examined. See *pag.*66,67,68,69,70,

Your thirteenth Objection, from 1 *Cor.*10.1. as I never ſuppoſed any great validity (as to the queſtion in hand) in it, ſo I ſhall not ſpend time in making any reply to the exceptions taken againſt it.

Mr. Blackwood.

Lydia, and all her family was baptized, but it is not ſaid her family beleeved, therefore its lawfull for perſons to be baptized, although they doe not beleeve. *Pag.* 46. *Object.*14.

1. Lydia, *and her family were baptized as Chriſt commanded, elſe* Paul *had contemned an Ordinance of God.* *Anſw.*

That they were baptized as Chriſt commanded is out of queſtion, But that Infants were not then baptized is to beg the queſtion. *Reply.*

2. *Its abſurd to baptize any one in the faith of their maſter or miſtreſſe. I aſk thoſe that hold Infants baptiſme, whether they would baptize all the ſervants of a Turke if he ſhould beleeve, though the ſervants did not beleeve.* *Pag.*47.

Theſe are of capacity to beleeve, and their unbeliefe is privative and damning, neither have they other title then faith to Baptiſme, being out of the ſociety of the people of God. *Reply.*

3. *Hard Scriptures are to be expounded by eaſie,* Nehe.8.8. *But in the ſame chapter, the Jailour and all his houſe beleeved, and then were baptized,* Acts 16.32,34. 18.8. *Ibid.*

Though that rule be ſafe, yet I would know how that Scripture in *Nehe.* proves it. For the Jaylours houſhold, If it were ſo in one it followes not it was ſo in all, and I referre you for a more full ſatisfaction to Mr. *Cooke*, his anſwer to the vanity of childiſh Baptiſme. *Pag.*45,46. *Reply.*

This is your 19. Objection, and I marvaile that it muſt be ſerved in at twice.

For Lydia *there is no mention of her being marryed, much leſſe of her having any children; but rather we may gather the contrary, becauſe ſhe was ſo importunate with the Apoſtles, perſons ſo hated to come to her houſe,* Acts 16.15. *had ſhe had a huſband ſhe durſt not have brought them in.* *Anſw.* *Pag.*59.

That conjecture is very weake, and unworthy of a reply *Joanna* *Reply.*

did as much, *Luke* 8.3. and yet we know ſhe was marryed, howſoever the precedent is of a whole family.

Ibid. 2. *Thoſe that were in* Lydia's *houſe were capable of conſolation,* ver. 40. *they entred into the houſe of* Lydia, *and when they had ſeen the brethren, they comforted them and departed.*

Reply. How many brethren did that unmaryed woman (do you think) harbour in her houſe? Theſe brethren were, doubtles, inhabitants of ſeverall familyes, in which the Apoſtles did give them a viſit.

Ibid. *For* Stephanus, *he was baptized, and all his houſhold, but it plainly appeares, there were no Infants in his houſe,* 1 Cor. 16.15. *The houſe did give themſelves to ſerve the Saints, therefore there were no Infants there.*

Reply. I pray you compare this expoſition of yours in this place, with that which (in the page next before) you give of thoſe words of our Saviour *Luke* 19.9. *This day is ſalvation come to this houſe,* Salvation (you ſay pag. 59.) *came not to every perſon in the houſe, but to the houſe:* I pray give us a reaſon why the houſe of *Stephanus* muſt containe every perſon in the houſe, ſo that all the houſe did actually miniſter to the Saints, and that the houſe of *Zacheus* containes not every perſon, but the perſon of *Zacheus* only, or elſe give us a rule that every Scripture is to be interpreted, as it will ſerve your purpoſe.

Ibid. *The manner of Baptizing Corinthians is ſet down* Acts 18.8. *many Corinthians hearing, beleeved and were baptized.*

Reply. So *Abraham*, hearing beleeved, and was circumciſed, That was the way of Baptiſme of men converted from heatheniſme, and ſo it was the way of Circumciſion.

Ibid. *The Scripture ſtill ſpeakes of children, when there is occaſion as* Exod. 12.37. Deut. 1.39. Jon. 4.11. Mat. 14.21.

Reply. If this rule hold, then Infants are to be diſcipled and baptized, ſeeing they are part of the nation to whom the Apoſtles were ſent with commiſſion, and there is no exception of Infants as is uſuall, when they are to be excepted, *Num.* 14.31. *Nehe.* 10.28. If occaſion had been to except them, then, in that commiſſion, they had been excepted.

Why there is no expreſſe mention of Infants Baptiſme.

2. All muſt neceſſarily grant, that it holds with far more ſtrength for us then for you, If Infants be not comprized in the *nation*, in the *houſhold*, then there is a change in the extent of the Covenant, and a

new manner of adminiſtration of the Seale, in reſpect of the ſubjects of it, And this of a neceſſity ſhould be expreſt, that ſo we might know the difference. But Infants being compriſed, things go in the wonted way, Gods expreſſion of himſelf for the latitude of the Covenant, and adminiſtration of the Seale, being ſo well known, an expreſſe mention is not needfull. In the negative an exception is neceſſary to exclude them, who in the Church in all ages, had been before received: In the affirmative, no expreſſe mention can be needfull to receive them, whoſe title and intereſt was never quſtioned, but without diſpute till that time had been received: Neither do the New Teſtament Scriptures uſe to be punctuall in circumſtances, eſpecially where there is light ſufficient from the Old Teſtament grounds.

Cornelius *his houſe feared God, but he was not yet inſtructed in the Meſſiah as already come, much leſſe baptized*, Acts 10 4.

Caſt your eye I pray you, on *Acts* 10.22. 47,48. together with the account that *Peter* gives to the Apoſtles and brethren, *Acts* 11. 14 15,16,17. and then ſpeake whether he and his houſe, were baptized or no. Your anſwers to objection 15. are already ſpoken to. *p.* 37

Mr. Blackwood.

As the child is borne free by the fathers freedome, ſo if God take the father into Covenant, he takes the children in with him, and if he rejects the parents the children are caſt out with them. As the ſonne of a Prieſt, or Levite, the ſonne of a State Officer, by birth hath right to his fathers Office, ſo in this caſe God takes the Father and children into the ſame Covenant. *Object.* 16. *Ibid.* Mr. *M. pag.* 15. and others.

1. *There can no argument be drawn from ſymbolicall divinity.* *Anſw.*

Neither Mr. *M.* nor any other (I am confident that you can name) make uſe of this, as an argument to evince Infants Baptiſme, nor yet to conclude any Covenant holineſſe, deſcending from parent to child, I ſhould be ſorry that any ſhould deale ſo weakely in this buſines, as to uſe ſimilitudes for arguments, or any otherwiſe then for illuſtrations. And the ſimilitude the Reader ſhall finde (if he conſult the Authors by whom it is uſed) every way fit for this purpoſe. *Reply.*

If by covenant, we meane the covenant of grace, no beleever is borne in this, being we all are by nature the children of wrath, much leſſe can the children be borne in any ſuch covenant. But if the objector pag. 48.

objector meaneth of ſome outward covenant, that is inrightment to Church priviledges, that by the fathers inrightment hereto, the child ſhould be inrighted, I anſwer firſt they muſt ſhew ſome copie that by the fathers inrightment in Church priviledges, all his children are inrighted, for that Acts 2. 38. *and* Gen. 17. 7. *we have anſwered before.*

Reply. What is meant, your objector hath abundantly declared himſelf, namely, an inrightment to Church-priviledges, which alſo is of grace, as you have heard at large; The validity of your exceptions to thoſe Scriptures by you named (together with other Scriptures and arguments which in the *Birth-Priviledge* may be ſeen) I doubt not but the ingenuous Reader will examine.

Ibid. *It infers an abſurdity, that a Chriſtian ſhould beget a Chriſtian, or elſe a perſon inrighted to the Seal of Chriſtianity, which is in effect the ſame: whereas he begets him as a man, not as a Chriſtian; and the Scripture ſpeaks of all, that they are by nature the children of wrath,* Eph. 2. 3.

Reply. So does a Nobleman beget a ſon *as a man*, and not *as a perſon of honour*. So a Free-man, A State-officer, that holds a Patent of inheritance, yet theſe beget ſons veſted with their deſcendable immunities and priviledges: And what thoſe be which are ſo veſted in the perſon, that they deſcend not to poſterity; and what on the contrary *Bir. Pri. p. 5, 6.* are deſcendable, elſwhere is at large declared. For the Apoſtles words, *Epheſ.* 2. 3. If you compare *Gal.* 2. 15. *Nature*, in the one place, with *Nature* in the other, you might have an anſwer at hand. An explication of both thoſe texts, & the reconciliation of the ſeem- *B. P. p. 2, 3.* ing repugnancie in them, the Reader may ſee in the ſame Treatiſe.

Pag. 49. *Many have defended the traduction of the Soule, but no Age before this defended the traduction of Chriſtianity.*

Reply. If you had ſaid, Moſt have denied the traduction of the Soule, But no Age before this, ever denied the traduction of Chriſtianitie, there had then been truth in your words, Taking Chriſtianitie in that ſenſe as it muſt (in this diſpute) be taken, and as you know it is underſtood. And I here offer, that if you or any other can bring any conſiderable witneſſes of credit (from the time of *Abraham* to this houre) that will ſay, that no ſuch thing was held in their Age in which they lived, no ſuch doctrine maintained, nor no practiſe bearing witneſſe to it uſed, I ſhall quit the cauſe, and betake

take my ſelfe to your party. The non-baptiſme of Infants (which you think you gather from *Acts* 2. 41. *Acts* 8. 12. not more than twelve lines before theſe words) is brought by you to overthrow the childs inrightment to Church-priviledges by the fathers right, Then the Baptiſme of Infants muſt of neceſſity eſtabliſh it, And you know that this is not the firſt Age in which Infants have been baptized. That it was the doctrine in times of Poperie, you cannot deny, ſeeing you faſten it upon Antichriſt, who is of greater antiquity than one age. It hath been one of the errors of the Reformed Churches, you alſo complaine; which lookes beyond one Age likewiſe. What out of Antiquitie may be found, we have heard, and you have not been able (with all your diligent ſearch of Antiquitie, of which you boaſt) to name one of the Ancient, or any one in any Age, that hath affirmed that the Church uſed no ſuch cuſtome in their dayes. *Tertullian*, thongh he manifeſt a diſlike, yet he bears witneſſe to the practice of it in his Age: and in this point of the traduction of Chriſtianitie, as you call it, he is expreſſe againſt you.

Mr. Blackwood. *Pag. 59.*

As ſoon as *Zacheus* profeſt the faith, the covenant of ſalvation comes to his houſe, foraſmuch as he is the ſon of *Abraham*. *Object. 11.*

All that can be gathered from the Text is, that ſaluation, or Chriſt who is called ſalvation, Luk. 2. 30. *comes to* Zacheus, *or any one that is a ſon of* Abraham: *but we Gentiles (its probable* Zacheus *was one, as being a Publican) are* Abrahams *ſons, not by deſcending from his loines, but* by walking in the ſteps of his faith, *Rom.* 4. 12. *Anſw.*

That *Zacheus* was a Gentile (if you can prove) I ſhall willingly yield: and this being agreed, the meaning of the words may eaſily be underſtood, namely, That ſaving ordinances (the meanes of ſalvation) was come to the houſe of *Zacheus*. Thus Chriſt uſes the word, *Salvation is of the Jewes*; They have ordinances in which ſalvation is to be had, and ſo have not you Samaritans. *Zacheus* (who before was *an alien from the commonwealth of Iſrael, and a ſtranger from the covenants of promiſe*, being none of the ſeed of the Jews, no ſon of *Abraham*) hath now ſalvation (ordinances of ſalvation incorporating him and his into this commonwealth) come to his houſe, in that he is become the ſeed of *Abraham*. How could *ſalvation* come to the houſe of *Zacheus* (when he alone was become the ſon of *Abraham*) unleſſe that the houſe for his ſake was intereſted in this *ſalvation*. *Reply.* Ioh. 4. 22.

vation. Compare with this, the Angels words to *Cornelius*, reported by *Peter*, *Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whoſe ſirname is Peter, who ſhall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy houſe ſhall be ſaved.* That word which *Peter* brought preaching Chriſt to him, who (as you ſay in the next page) was not inſtructed in the *Meſſiah*, was this ſalvation, which comes to his and to *Zacheus* houſe. Now both are the ſons of *Abraham*; and the *houſe*, in Scripture (as in our language) is the *ſtock*, the *family*, the *kindred*, the men at preſent of it, with poſterity. *Nathan* ſayes to *David*, *The Lord telleth thee that he will build thee an houſe*: and this *David* underſtands of poſterity: *Thou haſt ſpoken of thy ſervants houſe for a great while to come.* Conſider further thoſe words of *Peter* to the Jewes: *Ye are the children of the Prophets, and of the Covenant, which God made with our fathers; ſaying unto Abraham, And in thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth be bleſſed, unto you firſt; God having raiſed up his ſon Jeſus, ſent him to bleſſe you in turning every one of you from your iniquities.* God ſent Chriſt firſt, to that nation for bleſſedneſſe, and afterwards to all nations and kindreds, which can be no other than Chriſt in the Apoſtles mouths, Chriſt in the ordinances; They came with this bleſſedneſſe, thoſe ordinances that were able to ſave the ſoule, And this muſt be carried to all kindreds. Whereas you ſay, that *We are Abrahams ſons, not by deſcending from his loines, but by walking in the ſteps of his faith.* This is moſt true; neither were the proſelytes in the time of the Old Teſtament any otherwiſe the ſons of *Abraham*, and yet they had this ſalvation hereditary in their families, to them and poſterity. *The ſteps of Abrahams faith* is no other than *Abrahams religion*: and this is to the kindred, to the houſe, to poſterity, where it is received hereditary, except in the caſe of apoſtaſie.

Acts 11. 13, 14.

2 Sam. 7. 11. verſ. 19.

Acts 3. 25, 26.

Pag. 99. *Chriſt ſpeaks not of an outward covenant-holineſſe that comes to the houſe by* Zacheus *his being a ſon of* Abraham, *but of ſalvation; which came not to every perſon in the houſe, but only to the houſe; which it did as ſoon as* Zacheus *entertained Chriſt joyfully, though never an one elſe in the family ſhould receive him.*

Reply. That which you affirme, and that which you deny, is after your manner, ſingularly peremptory; but the Reader that deſires ſatisfaction, would be glad of ſomewhat towards a reaſon, eſpecially when you bring ſuch a Comment, that Chriſt ſhould ſay, ſalvation

is come to the houſe; when one only ſingle perſon in the houſe was ſaved. And which in the beginning of the next page you doe ſo egregiouſly contradict, *Stephanas* his houſe muſt be every perſon in the houſe, not ſo much as an Infant excepted, His houſe-miniſters to the Saints, and therefore there was not an Infant in it. And ſalvation comes to *Zacheus* houſe, being (as appeares in the contex, a great family) when it comes only to one ſingle perſon in it. Thoſe (that to avoid an outward covenant-holineſſe) will have ſalvation to be taken in your ſenſe, and yet entaile it upon poſterity, and give them title by an hereditary deſcent, much gratifie you, I acknowledge; but as it fares with all that ſtep aſide from the truth, they plunge themſelves in inextricable difficulties, and a laberinth of contradictions. To make ſaving grace hereditary, and the birth from heaven deſcendable, is a new and uncouth piece of Divinity, as contrary to Scripture as experience: Or to avoyd the abſurdity of it, to make the words of Scripture (delivered in the moſt abſolute way) to hold *ad plurimum*, (*Your children are holy*, that is, rather yours than others; *If the root be holy, then the branch*, that is more like to be holy than the branch of another root) is to offer ſtrange violence to the holy Scriptures.

For your 18. Objection, If any will own an Argument ſo framed, let them defend it: As you quote no author, ſo I believe you can find none that hath ſo diſputed: and though exceptions might be eaſily taken againſt your anſwer, yet enough hath been ſpoken already to the ſame purpoſe.

Your 19. Obj. which is alſo the 14. hath already been examined. See *pag.* 111.

Mr. Blackwood.

Baptiſme of Infants is not forbidden in Scripture; therefore it is lawfull. *Object.* 20.

Reply. I ſhall put it in other termes: It is commanded in Scripture, therefore it is lawfull, yea neceſſary. You imply in your anſwer a diſtinction of Scriptures *forbidding any thing in ſo many words, or by conſequence.* With allowance of that diſtinction, I ſhall enter liſts with Mr. *Blackwood* to make good the Antecedent, that Baptiſme of Infants is commanded.

Mr. Blackwood.

But here is no alteration of the worſhip, but only of the ſubject; for the manner of baptizing is the ſame. *Object.* 21.

Reply. Neither alteration of the worſhip, nor the ſubject, you ſhould have put it, and that is the Argument in its due ſtrength; for we confeſſe not any alteration in either, Though a man that would put himſelfe to defend the Argument as it lies, (which no wiſe man I ſuppoſe will) might be able to returne an anſwer to your Reaſons againſt it. You ſay, *the Lawgivers will is, that only believers, whoſe ſins in the judgement of charity are forgiven, ſhould be baptized.* I pray you tell us where we may find a text of Scripture that ſets up our charity for a Judge in theſe things. That it is an eſſentiall point in worſhip that the ſubject be right you would prove from *Pro.* 15. 8 *The prayers of the wicked are an abomination:* whence you ſeeme to ground your diſpute, *That it is as unlawfull for a Miniſter to baptize an Infant, as for a wicked man to pray.* Now I aſſume, *that a wicked man ought to pray,* Act. 8. 22. Here is a double error. 1. To confound thoſe together who are active, and thoſe that are only paſſive in Worſhip, as Infants are in Baptiſme. 2. To make no diſtinction between the man that performs a worſhip, and the manner of performance. This of Prayer God requires, as his homage, of all the world; The wicked offend not becauſe they doe it, (they ſhould more offend in not doing, *Eccleſ.* 9. 2. *Pſal.* 14. 4.) but in the ill manner of doing. You might as well ſay, they ought not to love God, feare God, believe God, as that they ought not pray to God: Theſe are all within that firſt and great Commandement, and while God is God, there can be no diſpenſation to any of the ſons of *Adam.*

Mr. Blackwood.

Object. 23. There are three great miſchiefes goe along with denying Infants
Pag. 52. Baptiſme; As firſt, they reject the obſervation of the Lords day.
Anſw. *We deny it; and the generality of thoſe that are againſt Infants Baptiſme, receive it, obſerve it, &c.*

Reply. We muſt range through the world to examine mens thoughts, and look into their practiſes, to make reply to this anſwer. Take heed of a reall refutation, not from the pen, but the practiſe of your own party.

2. They take their proſelytes wholy off from the Miniſtery.

Anſ. *I know the contrary among many perſons in a Church-way.* That way is more large (as it is now called) then your opinion. All yours may be guilty of this charge, notwithſtanding your defence: And you ſpeak only for many; It ſeems the greateſt part of

thoſe

thoſe that you ſpeak for in this Church way, are guilty.

2. Look into the confeſſion of the faith of your Churches, and ſee what they leave to the miniſtry, *All of gifts, may, and ought to propheſy.* And the *perſon deſigned to diſpenſe Baptiſme, is* (with them) *a preaching diſciple*, for which the leading proofe is *Iſa.* 8 16. when the word and Sacraments are both made over to ordinary members, what is now left for Miniſters; Theſe Churches are none of your many, They take their proſelytes off from the Miniſtery. *Art.* 45. *Art.* 41.

If you would in your ſeverall Preſbyteries conſent to forbeare ſuch doubtfull diſputations, both in your Sermons and Prayers, the perſons you ſo accuſe, would be willing to heare, &c. *Ibid.*

Have you ſo deeply charged (and with ſo great confidence) the faith of the Churches of Chriſt, and do you now confeſſe that the diſpute is doubtfull? and do you heare that theſe things are diſputed, not onely in Sermons but Prayers? you can pleade (*page* 57.) out of *Ambroſe* for liberty to ſpeake what you thinke againſt us, and this liberty muſt be denyed us towards you, If you challenge liberty to ſpeake your conſciences doubtingly, give us leave to ſpeake ours, beleevingly. *Reply.*

Mr. Blackwood.

Your third miſchiefe is ſufficiently ſpoken to already and aſſerted *pag.* 73. *Object* 24. *Pag.* 53.

There is no expreſſe command, no example in the New Teſtament of womens recieving the Lords Supper, for the celebration of a weekely Sabbath.

That women recieved the Lords Supper appeares. *Anſw.*

1. *From example* Acts 1.14. Acts 2.1. *compared, thoſe women were ſtill preſent, and the Sacrament was adminiſtred,* ver. 42. *Ibil.*

It ſeemes otherwiſe. The Holy Ghoſt came on all preſent, in the forme of *Cloven tongues ver.* 3. which was to make good the promiſe of Chriſt for power, for miniſteriall gifts to preach the Goſpel in all nations, and of this women were not capable. *Reply.*

2. *It appeares from reaſon.* *Ibil.*

Both your examples and your reaſons are by way of collection, and inference from Scriptures, upon theſe termes we will joyne iſſue, for tryall of Infants right to Baptiſme. *Reply.*

The Sabbath is commanded indeterminately in the fourth Commandement. *Ibid.*

Reply. Give us but the liberty that you take, to looke into the Old Teſtament for light, to underſtand New Teſtament Ordinances.

Mr. Blackwood.

Object. 25. Pag. 55. The denying of Infants Baptiſme is contrary to the practiſe of all the Churches, and caſts an aſperſion upon them.

Anſwer. *I have heard otherwiſe, that there are Churches in* Tranſylvania, *and* Holland, *that ſo practiſe.*

Rep. And you may heare further of thoſe Churches (eſpecially in *Tranſylvania*) that they are as ready to fall upon you with a ſtorme, as you upon the Churches of Chriſt, charging you with Antichriſtianiſme in the Doctrine of the Trinity and Chriſts Incarnation, &c.

Ibid. 2. *We find the Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles, and the firſt* 300 *yeares welnigh, if not altogether cleare for us.*

Reply. For a full diſcovery of the notable untruth of this aſſertion, I referre the Reader no further then your 12th. argument for the unlawfulnes of Infants Baptiſme. With all your diligent ſearch, we have not from you one piece of a witneſſe, to deny the practiſe of Baptiſme of Infants in that time, but much to the contrary.

Ibid. 3. *All the Churches erred for many hundred yeares, ſince the time of the Antichriſtian Apoſtaſy, not onely in ſmaller matters, but in poynt of the Maſſe, juſtification by workes, tranſubſtantiation, judge of the faith, &c.*

Reply. I wiſh you had made it your ſtudy to have diſcovered thoſe errours, that ſo you might not have been found an enemy to the truths of reformed Churches.

Ibid. 4. *They have I ſuppoſe erred (I meane the Proteſtant, conſiſting of* Lutheran *and* Calvinian *Churches) in the particulars ſince the Reformation, which I ſhould be lothe to riſle, but that onely the matter comes in competition with Gods glory.*

Reply. I deſire to know how you came by that light for diſcovery of ſo many of your brethrens errours, living (as you complaine) under Perſecution, and Conſcience-compulſion, which takes away (if you may be beleeved) *the poſſibility of comming to the light of any new truth,* Part 1. Pag. 16. Theſe diſcoveries of yours, all will ſay are new, Truths they are not, you are in no poſſible capacity of a new truth, your errours then in charging errour on the Churches ſhall be examined.

Ibid. 1. *In retayning the Baptiſme which they had from the hands of*

Popiſh

Popiſh Prieſts, which they could never retaine, without acknowledging the Roman Church to be a true Church, and their Prieſthood to be true, and their miniſters to be the miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt.

The Baptiſme thus received, they could never waſh off, and maintaine the Pope (the head of that faction) to be Antichriſt, who oppoſes not Chriſt openly but in a myſtery, & is not wholy without, but in the Temple of God. Your ſelf acknowledge many truths in that Church, *as the Trinity, the Reſurrection, with an &c.* why muſt we then of neceſſity deny the truth of this Sacrament of Baptiſme to be alſo with them, who have both the matter and forme of Baptiſme entire? You profeſſe your ſelf a diligent ſearcher of antiquities, and what do you finde out of antiquity to reject Baptiſme, received from the hands of Heretiques where the eſſence is retained? *Cyprian* was indeed in that opinion, but he was generally oppoſed by Divines down to this age, and in this age, *Auſtin* indeed commends his modeſty in this errour, *not condemning them raſhly, who were in another opinion.* And if you will not diſclaime this errour, (as ſome affirme that *Cyprian* did) I would we might commend like modeſty in you, not to condemne ſo many glorious Churches, who in this are not of your minde; your ſelf acknowledge ſomewhat of the being of a Church in *Rome*, oppoſing the Roman and Reformed Churches, If we (leaving them) are Churches reformed, then they are a Church polluted, and deformed. Prieſthood and Miniſtery is there by you ſtrangely confounded: Their Prieſthood is wholy Antichriſtian, what ever they do *qua* Prieſts we juſtly condemne, Chriſt ſends not *ad miſſandum* or *ſacrificandum*, to Maſſe or Sacrifice (That mandate is the Popes) but to Preach and Baptize, As we reject not the Trinity, or Reſurrection, when they have preacht it, ſo we do not reject Baptiſme when they have adminiſtred it. And when you have condemned all Miniſtery, and Baptiſme (both ours and theirs) you will hardly finde a way to ſet up any Miniſtery, or eſtabliſh any Baptiſme, but leave us among the *Seekers* (as now they are called) who deny any Church, or Miniſtery at all upon earth; The gates of hell having prevailed (as it ſeemes) againſt Chriſts promiſe, and ſo waite for a new revelation, and ſome extraordinary new way from heaven, who are to recieve a like anſwer to that of *Abraham* to the rich man, *They have Moſes and the Prophets, The Prophets and the Apoſtles* for foundations to build upon: Theſe are the

Reply.

2 *Theſ.* 2. 4.

Part 1. *p.* 16.

Auguſtin de Bap. contra Donat. lib. 5. *c.* 17.

Luke 16. 29.

Epheſ. 2. 20.

the last times, and after these we must look for no new wayes of administration.

Ibid. 2. *They erred, in that the Elders of the Churches recieved all sorts of persons to Baptisme, upon a supposed Covenant-Holinesse, derived from the parents, which were Idolaters in the grossest Idolatry for many a hundred yeares.*

Reply. And is this any other then the traduction of Christianity, which *pag.* 49. you said none ever defended before this age? How then were our first Reformers, and *Rome* for many a hundred yeare guilty of it? Your objector may well beare your charge of error, seeing you lay it upon all the Protestant Churches, as well as upon him without one word for their conviction. For Idolatry (which you charge upon our forefathers in the dayes of Popish darkenesse) we must distinguish of it.

1. As worshipping of a false God.

2. As worshipping the true God, in a false way.

The former dischurches a people, and wholy casts them out of covenant; His people they are whom they serve; of this our forefathers were not guilty, They worshipped the true God (by your own confession, if one God and three persons be the true God) yea they beleeve all things right, concerning the person of Christ in both natures, both his Divinty and Humanity. Take heed how you deny all covenant-relation of a people thus tainted: So you will not only cast off the ten tribes (who still retained circumcision, and were re-
2 Chron. 30. cieved to the passeover when they came at *Hezekiahs* call) but *Juda* also, under *Asa, Jehosaphat*, and those other Princes that kept up the high places. The providence of God brought the Scriptures to us by their hand, as to the Primitive Christians by the Scribes and Pharises, As we recieve from them the Scriptures, so also whatsoever is found with them according to the Scriptures.

Ibid. 3. *In that Elders, Members, and the whole Church did agree, that the Church should be divided by parishes, making cohabitation or dwelling together, a sufficient inrightment to such priviledges, till the other day almost, the Independent Churches began to spy out this abomination.*

Reply. Somewhat more then cohabitation, is required by Protestant Churches, for such inrightment, So a Jew or Turke (renting a house) should become a member of a Christian congregation; It is then (not a bare

a bare cohabitation, but) a cohabitation of Chriſtians, accepting of Ordinances, that is an inrightment; And I ſuppoſe we muſt ſtay till to morrow, & the third day, before any abomination be diſcovered in this way of theſe Churches: And when the diſcovery comes out, we ſhall expect a diſcovery alſo of the abomination of quotations, of *cap.* and *ver.* of Scriptures, of preaching on a Text, of writing Sermons in the time of hearing, yea alſo of your much applauded Canon of the Councell of *Nice*, dividing their congregations into three ſorts, When all things of humane accomodation, for the regulating of worſhip ſhall beare this cenſure, theſe things will come within the verge. If the Proteſtant Churches ſhould make it *an eſſentiall requiſite to a conſtituted Church*: as you do your Covenant, perhaps it would prove as hard a taxe, to make it good, as you finde it, to make good your Covenant. And if a man durſt take your liberty, he might finde more fayre proofes for parochiall Churches, then your Scriptures (*Act.*2.41,47. and *Act.*9.6.) will afford for your Covenant, we might tell you of the Pariſh of *Cenchrea*, & *Laodicea*, Thoſe that wil have one Church to conſiſt onely of one Congregation, would herein much pleaſure us: ſo all the Chriſtians within the compaſſe of ſuch a place (as *Epheſus*, *Corinth*, *&c.*) make up one onely Church: And what is that but one Pariſh? *Part* 1. *Page* 8.

The fourth errour, which you charge upon the Proteſtant Churches, is the ſame with the ſecond of thoſe miſchiefes which you charge upon the Baptiſme of Infants, which already is ſpoken to, See *pag.*37,38.

5. *They have erred in the continuation of Epiſcopacy for ſo many hundred yeares, though in ſome places the name is now changed into Superintendency.* *Ibid.*

All the Churches have not been in this guilty, ſome never were under Epiſcopacy, not the *French*, nor *Geneva* Churches: and ſome have left them off, and never willingly ſubmitted, as the Scottiſh Church. *Rep.*

None of them have been ſo long guilty, as to have herein erred ſo many hundred yeares, Some of them are not of one hundred yeares ſtanding, we of this Nation are not out of our firſt Century, and the Church of *Scotland* is yet of a more late ſtanding, you are as unhappy in your Chronology in the buſines of Epiſcopacy in

theſe ages, as you were in the buſineſſe of Baptiſme of Infants in the Primitive times.

While Epiſcopacy hath beenin ſome Churches, it hath not been ſo much the erroar of many, as their burden; Thoſe that you think ſo much changed, have for a geart part no other thoughts of that calling now, then they had in former times.

Ibid. 6. *I will ſpeake little of the mutuall invectives of the Lutherans againſt the Calviniſts, & of theſe againſt Lutherans, even in publique aſſemblies, yet I could never reade of any of the Miniſters cenſured for this great violation of charity, nor of the power of compulſion, that hath been given to the Civil Magiſtrate, &c.*

Reply. And I ſhall reply as little, and for their neglect of cenſure, ſeeing you reckon it up among the errours of thoſe Churches, I am content that it ſo reſt, and doe not intend any apology for them; you afterwards tell us of *the baniſhment of Mollerus from* Wittenburg, *&* Zanchy *from* Strasbrug, *& many others*, of which (it ſeems) you were an eye-witnes, for it is not within the compaſſe of your reading: Baniſhment is a cenſure, and theſe were Miniſters, and yet yon never read of any of the Miniſters cenſured, nor any power in the civill Magiſtrate for compulſion.

Mr. Blackwood.

Object. 26. There are many miſchiefes go along with it, and therefore we ought to abandon this Doctrine.

1. There will be a wide doore ſet open to heatheniſme, for a great part of the world will in time become Heathens, ſeeing many that go for Chriſtians partake of nothing in Chriſtianity but their Baptiſme.

Anſw. *This will be no dammage, but benefit to Chriſtianity, ſeeing that many that live the lives of Heathens will be diſcovered.*

Reply. Your 23. Objection was, Three great miſchiefes go along with it: and this objection is, many miſchiefes: It ſeemes you were both to encounter many at once; And I would you would tell us who preſſeth this miſchiefe in theſe words, Here is no faire dealing, neither with brother nor adverſary, your reaſon that it will be no damage is yet very weake: That benefit (by you named) may be over-ballanced with many unſufferable evils, and there may be other meanes of redreſſe, then ſo deſperate a way of cure.

That which you now object to your ſelf, as a miſchiefe following

ing upon the denyall of Infants Baptiſme; before you brought as an Argument to overthrow it. It is the fourth of your corrupt grounds, pretended to bring in Baptiſme of Infants, *pag.* 25. And already hath been ſpoken to, and ſundry benefits by Baptiſme of Infants named, counterpoyſing this one ſuppoſed benefit in the delay of it: *pag.* 50.

2. This will overthrow Pariſhes or parochiall Churches. *Ibid.*

Anſ. True.

This, if you were pleaſed, you could deny, and there is more dependance between other opinions by you diſclaimed, and this Doctrine, Then is between it, and the overthrow of parochiall Churches, and in my knowledge, all of thoſe that (with you) deny the Baptiſme of Infants, do not alſo make this (as you do) an abomination, but will be as zealous to defend, as you to oppoſe it. *Rep.*

I feare me this parochiall conſtitution, and the large tithes that accompany it, are one of the greateſt objections that hinders the paſſage of this truth. *Ibid.*

And may not I as juſtly feare, that your high applauſe and commendation of your ſelves upon all occaſions (as men reſolved to beare *baniſhment, perſecution, and runne the hazard of certaine ruine for the truth*) in which you, among others, take not the leaſt freedome, *Part* 1. *Page* 12. *Part* 2. *Page* 57. and your charge of others with ſelf ſeeking (through covetuouſneſſe making marchandize of ſoules) is one of your chiefe engines to hooke in this errour, Some that hold this Doctrine can (with a good conſcience) ſay, that a large tithe is to them no temptation. *Reply.*

This of tithes you would willingly ſerve in, as a ſecond abomination, which how weake ſoever, yet is like to prove a winning way, men will be your proſelytes to ſave charges, your ſelf acknowledge, *that Kings and Queenes may be Nurſing Fathers, and Nurſing Mothers by countenancing, & Contributing towards Religion, and the maintenance, & profeſſors thereof, by improving all their credit and eſtate to the good of the people of God*, may not they then (provided it be in a juſt and legall way, overthrowing no civill priviledges of their Subjects) provide maintenance by way of tithes, which is a civil tribute, 1 *Sam.* 8. 15. frequently laid upon Subjects by the Heathen Roman Emperours? *Part.* 1. *Pag.* 31.

3. Though this were truth, yet now it is unſeaſonable, when there are ſo many diviſions. *Ibid.*

Anſw. *It is moſt ſeaſonable now: had it come at any other time, an Epiſcopall or Presbyteriall power might have cruſhed it. There were never more times of likelihood, then when men are upon ſuch a generall inquiry for the truth.*

Reply. I ſhould be ſorry to know any ſo weak in their judgements, as to yeeld it to be a truth; or ſo cold in their zeale, as (upon ſuch a ſuppoſition) to bring ſuch a plea for ſuppreſſion of it: but it is your cuſtome to ſet up a man of ſtraw for an adverſary, and then to ſhew your valour in fighting againſt him. And here you ſpeak your whole heart concerning your reſolution to ſuffer perſecution, in chooſing ſuch a time that you may be ſecure from all danger of it. This muſt indeed be confeſt to be a time very opportune to vent your doctrine, in which men *will not endure ſound doctrine, but after their own luſts will heap to themſelves teachers, having itching eares, and turning away their eares from the truth.* You (with ſeverall others) have as deſired a time for your truths, and the ſpreading of them, as *Micah* ſometimes found for his, as the Scripture obſerves, *Judg.* 17. 5, 6. A time (I mean) of an univerſall liberty.

2 Tim. 4. 3, 4.

4. That ſuch perſons as hold this, are going into deeper errors, and that this is but the entrance, And that God gives up ſuch perſons every where to dangerous opinions.

Anſ. *This is but one of Satans old juglings. I know, moſt that I have been acquainted with, are as ſound in the faith as our accuſers; free from Socinianiſme, Familiſme, Popery, Arminianiſme, or any other doctrine that is unſound; and ſhall be ready to give a confeſſion of our faith (if we ſhall be duly called thereto) wherein we ſhall confeſſe what we hold in oppoſition to the forenamed errors.*

Reply. This were a new peece of jugling in Satan, if he could caſt ſo thick a miſt over the eyes of men, as not to ſee the errors which men of this opinion maintaine, and which daily increaſe among them. Such a ſleep in which ſo many tares are ſown, and not at all diſcerned, were indeed a dead ſleep. All will believe that you ſpeak as favorably of your own party as may be, and ſpeak truly: You deal therefore wiſely (in this your apologie) to ſpeak thus cautelouſly, only for the moſt of your acquaintance. A conſiderable part of thoſe of this opinion, of your acquaintance, we may take from your own mouth, to be men tainted with *Socinianiſme, Familiſme, Popery, Arminianiſme*, and other unſound doctrines: and for thoſe without your

acquaintance, of whom you (as others) have intelligence; we may conclude, that you suspect the most of them to stand not right. In all my acquaintance, I have not been so happy, as to meet with any more then one man of your mind in this thing, and otherwise orthodox. For your readines to give account of your faith, (for your selfe I doe not speak, for I hope better things; but generally) it will be little satisfactory, There is so much experience of men venting doctrines, which some hearers judge to be but a little below blasphemie, Antinomianisme in the height; other hearers applaud for new light: yet the Teachers being questioned (either authoritatively, or friendly, in a more private way) will professe that they hold, nor teach, no other thing than the Divines of the Reformed Churches have ever in those points delivered. Which if they would but speak out in their Pulpits, and other meetings, their crowded auditories would be like other mens, They might heare elsewhere, old truths, But these must be fed with novell-curiosities. What is vented, I tremble to relate, even such things as (by Mr. *Black Woods* approbation) the Magistrate ought to punish.

5. It is against charity, in making a Schisme in the Church.

How is it possible to recover the soules of men out of this will-worship, but by dividing them from the common practise? *Answ.*

You seem elswhere to deliver such rules that might in this thing (notwithstanding your opinion) hold you silent, Seeing you are *not infallible in your dictates, and all errors of mens soules are not of the same size; Such persons* (you say) *may be borne withall, that trench not on the foundation.* *Reply.* Part 1. p. 24.

2. *Christ and his Apostles were not Schismatiques in keeping his passeover two dayes different from the received practice of the Jewish Church: God commanded,* Num. 9. 3. *that it should be kept on the* 14. *day of the first moneth in the appointed season, and the Jewish teachers and people put it off to the* 16. *day, as appeares, because the day Christ was crucified on, was the day after his Passeover,* Mat. 20. 19, 20. *compared with* John 18. 28. *But the day he was crucified on, was the day before the Passeover, as appeares* John 18. 28. 19. 14. *No more are we Schismatiques, keeping to the rule, though the generality of men practise otherwise.*

What paines doe you take to hook in this example, that you and your followers may be parallel with Christ and his Disciples. But *Reply:*

you might have done well to have ſtudied it a little better, before you had vented your ſelfe in it, as a thing taken for granted, that there was two dayes difference between Chriſts Paſſeover and the Iews. Many have ſpoke of one days difference, but none (that I have read or heard of) ever affirmed that there was two dayes diſtance between them. For your Reaſon, I marvaile that you do not ſee that it is without reaſon: The Paſſeover, you know, was by command to be in the evening, And the evening, with the Iewes, began the day; So that Chriſt kept his Paſſeover the day that he was crucified. To explane it: the evening of Thurſday did belong to Friday; or if you make the evening to belong to the day paſt, as we doe, then the Jewes did ſo likewiſe; and preparing for the Paſſeover, they eat it on the evening of that day on which they made preparation for it.

It were an endleſſe buſineſſe to enter here upon that diſpute, whether Chriſt and his Apoſtles obſerved their Paſſeover, the ſame day as the Jewes, or whether there was one dayes difference between them. Many ſpeak out of Antiquities of a cuſtome that the Jewes had, when their feaſts happened the next day to the Sabbath, to tranſlate them to the Sabbath day; which is fathered on one Rabbi *Eliezer*: And that accordingly they did tranſlate the feaſt of the Paſchall Lambe this yeere of Chriſts death, to be obſerved on the day of the Sabbath. Now Chriſt (they ſay) conformed not to this cuſtome, but while others kept their tradition, he obſerved the Law. So *Aretius*. He that pleaſes may read *Baronius in Appar. Anno* 34. and *Cauſabon* againſt him. The authority of thoſe that have affirmed ſuch a cuſtome to have been held amongſt the Jewes, together with the Scriptures by you mentioned (with the Comment that ſome have given of them) held me faſt (I confeſſe) for ſome time in that opinion. *Unleſſe with violence we will wreſt Johns words, we muſt yeeld* (ſaith Bucer) *that the Jewes celebrated it the day after, &c.* But I have found thoſe authorities by learned Pens of late much weakned, and many teſtimonies alleadged that no ſuch cuſtome was in uſe in our Saviours time. And upon more full conſideration, The thing it ſelf to me ſeemes very improbable, that they had eſtabliſhed ſuch a canon or tradition, and that Chriſt diſſented from it. 1. Chriſt tells his Diſciples, *Ye know that after two dayes is the feaſt of the Paſſeover,* Mat. 26. 2.

ſpeaking

ſpeaking of a time well known; which he had not ſaid, had he obſerved it at a different time from the Iewes received cuſtome. 2. Chriſt ſends two Diſciples in a publike way to prepare for it, to beſpeak a great chamber, *that he might eat his Paſſeover with his Diſciples*, which implies one uniforme obſervation of the time, when houſholders let out roomes for all gueſts for the obſervation of it. 3. *Iudas* was with Chriſt at his Paſſeover, from whom the Prieſts and Phariſees had, what intelligence concerning Chriſt they pleaſed. But this tranſgreſſion of their rule (which they would never have borne) was never objected among all that was laid to his charge. 4. If the Prieſt were according to the Law, either to kill or offer the Paſchall Lamb (as many learned contend) then it could not be done on a day different from the generall obſervation of it. The Prieſts would never have gratified Chriſt and his Diſciples in ſuch an irregularitie and ſuppoſed factious practiſe. Others ſay, that this dayes difference was occaſioned by the Jews, reckoning the day from the φάσις or appearance of the Moon, for which the Senate ſate to heare witneſſes, and all Jews were bound to follow their decree, upon teſtimony given; and the Senate many times refuſing to accept the teſtimony of undoubted witneſſes, our Saviour, and the moſt pious Jews refuſed to follow it. But this is ſubject to the ſame difficulties as the former, and the reaſons before alleadged doe all militate againſt it. Would Chriſt have ſaid, *Ye know after two dayes, &c.* when the time was known only upon ſuch doubtfull teſtimony? And it is not like, that Chriſt and ſome private Jews would give ſentence in matter of fact (as I may ſay) againſt the Senate, on witneſſe heard, and teſtimony received. For that reaſon further given of ſuch a difference, out of *Epiphanius*, that at this time there was a tumult and contention amongſt the Iewes about the Paſſeover, and ſo ſome Iewes kept it on the ſame day with our Saviour, and ſome, as *John* witneſſes, the day after. This ſpoiles your paralel. So Chriſt did not differ from the received practiſe, or goe againſt the generality of the Iewes way: and yet this to me appeares as unlike as the former, unleſſe the difference happened after Chriſts comming to *Hieruſalem*; for two dayes before it he ſpeaks as of a ſet and known time, as we have heard. For the Scriptures by you quoted, that *it was the preparation of the Paſſeover*, and *that the Iewes went not into the Iudgment Hall*, Luk. 22.8,9, 10.

that

that they might be clean to take the Passeover: That satisfies me, that the Passeover is taken either strictly for the Paschall Lambe, or more largely for the whole of all those sacrifices which at that feast
Deut.16.2. of unleavened bread were to be offered. *Thou shalt sacrifice the Passeover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock, and of the heard*; when the Paschall Lambe was of the flock, and not of the heard. These are called by the name of Passeover, and for these they must be cleane, as for the Paschall Lambe. Here I find indeed exception taken at our English translation, and affirmed, that according to a severall punctation, and a severall supplying of something, that must be understood: The words may be expounded severall wayes, but I find no other translation reading them otherwise. And that
2 Chro.35.7. passage in *Iosiahs* Passeover, me thinks, confirmes it: The 30000 Lambs and Kids, and the 3000 Bullocks are all for Passeover-offerings; And the whole feast of seven dayes (in which unleavened bread was to be eaten) is called the Passeover. But were it
Ezek.45.21. yeelded that Christ and his Disciples observed the Passeover apart, you must either produce a set time for Baptisme out of Scripture, in such a yeere, moneth, day, as you doe for the Passeover, and hold you close to it (as Christ did, when others vary from it) otherwise you may be guilty of Schisme, when Christ and his Disciples are to be deservedly honoured for their obedience.

3. *With* Luther *I say*, Potius quam, &c. *Rather than any thing depart from the glory of God, let not only peace, but heaven and earth fall.*

Reply. The glory of God is too often pretended, when our own glory and name is sought, *Isa.66.5.* And I wish that your zeale for an opinion singular from your brethren, may provoke others to contend with like zeale for Truth, keeping the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace; that so, *To God only may be glory.*

FINIS.

Numb. 97. 11

Sir Thomas Fairfax *and Major* Skippon *designed to advance into the West, for the reliefe of* Taunton. Wellington *house blown up by the Parliaments Forces:* 50 *of that Garrison slain, and* 150 *taken by the Enemy. An exact List of the Prisoners taken in the late defeat of Pr.* Maurice *his Forces. Gen.* Leven *advancing Southward. The passages at the besieging of* Scarborough *Castle, and severall batteries made therein.*

THE KINGDOMES Weekly Intelligencer:

SENT ABROAD To prevent mis-information.

From *Tuesday* the 22. of *April*, to *Tuesday* the 29. of *April*. 1645.

THat which came first to my hands since the last week, being a Letter of the gallant exploit performed by Col. *Bridges*, I shall now first of all communicate in this Intelligence, though it hath been mentioned by others, This containing a List of the Prisoners names, more fully and exactly relating the particulars of that service, than any you had formerly: The substance of it briefly thus:

On Friday last, The Enemy advanced with a body of 400 Horse neere to *Sherburne*, within two miles of *Warwick*, having it seemes intelligence, that our Horse were gone as a Convoy to *Glocester* with the Ammunition, which they intended to have surprized, but missing of that designe, they were resolved to doe something, though it were but to plunder the Country before they went back, which they did, and sent